

**City Services Performance Report  
for Fiscal Year 2003**

March 2004

**City Auditor's Office**

**City of Kansas City, Missouri**

March 16, 2004

Honorable Mayor and Members of the City Council:

This is our third annual city services performance report. In this report we provide 2003 citizen survey results along with performance information in six broad categories: streets, public safety, parks, water and sewer, neighborhood livability, and overall quality of life. We worked with an advisory panel a couple of years ago to select performance measures in these areas that focus on community conditions and service outcomes.

Our intent is for the performance information to provide balance and context for the survey data – both to be fair to city staff in addressing their concerns that survey results are not a complete picture, and to be fair to citizens so that their perceptions are considered. Our report continues to be a work in progress. For example, this year's report includes education as a component in our assessment of the city's overall quality of life category. Also, some data are not available, are difficult to explain or interpret, or have not been updated since our last report. However, we hope that this report still encourages discussion about city performance. As we listen to and participate in that discussion, one of our objectives will be to continue to improve the clarity and utility of this report.

While the city faces challenges, we do not believe its service problems are intractable. We have seen some improvement in areas where the city has made an investment in time, money, or attention. For example, citizen satisfaction with snow removal on major city streets has improved since 2002. So has citizen satisfaction with city street lighting. Citizen satisfaction with water services is above the average for the metropolitan area.

We appreciate the courtesy and cooperation of city, Police Department, MAST, and area school district staff in helping us to compile and assess the reliability of this information. The audit team on this project was Anatoli Douditski, Suzanne Polys, Joan Pu, Vivien Zhi, and Gary White.

Mark Funkhouser  
City Auditor

---

# City Services Performance Report for Fiscal Year 2003

---

## Table of Contents

---

Introduction	1
Objectives	1
Scope and Methodology	1
Background	3
Results	5
Summary of the 2003 Citizen Survey	5
Overall Priorities	8
Benchmarking Data on Citizens' Overall Satisfaction with Major Categories of Services	9
Citizens' Overall Satisfaction with Major Categories of Services	10
Streets	11
Citizen Satisfaction Benchmarking Data	12
Citizen Satisfaction with Streets	13
Maintenance Priorities	14
Street Services Performance Indicators	15
Public Safety	21
Benchmarking Data	22
Citizen Satisfaction with Public Safety	23
Public Safety Priorities	25
Public Safety Performance Indicators	26
Parks and Recreation	33
Citizen Satisfaction Benchmarking Data	34
Citizen Satisfaction with Parks and Recreation	35
Use of Parks and Recreation Facilities	36
Parks and Recreation Priorities	37
Parks and Recreation Performance Indicators	38

Water and Sewer Services	45
Citizen Satisfaction with Water and Sewer Services	46
Water and Sewer Services Performance Indicators	47
Neighborhood Livability	51
Citizen Survey Benchmarking Data	52
Citizen Satisfaction with Neighborhood Livability	53
Code Enforcement Priorities	54
Performance Indicators	55
Overall Quality of Life	63
Citizen Survey Benchmarking Data	64
Citizen Satisfaction with Overall Quality of Life	65
Performance Indicators	66

---

## Introduction

---

### Objectives

We conducted this audit pursuant to Article II, Section 13 of the Charter of Kansas City, Missouri, which establishes the Office of the City Auditor and outlines the City Auditor's primary duties.

The purpose of this audit is to report the 2003 citizen survey results along with performance indicators in six broad areas related to city services: streets, public safety, parks, water and sewer, neighborhood livability, and overall quality of life. Our aim was to highlight a few key performance indicators focusing on community conditions and outcomes to supplement citizen survey data.

We do not independently interpret and evaluate the performance information reported. In other words, the report does not say whether the city is doing a good or bad job in any of these areas. However, we hope the report encourages public discussion about city performance and expectations for performance. We also plan to use the information collected in deciding future audit topics.

---

### Scope and Methodology

#### Survey Methodology

We contracted with ETC Institute to conduct a telephone survey to measure citizen satisfaction with city services and identify which services citizens think should receive the most emphasis over the next two years. The telephone survey was conducted in November and December 2003 and administered to 1,210 households throughout the city. At least 200 surveys were completed in each of the city's six council districts. Survey results have a 95 percent confidence level and a margin of error up to +/- 3

percent. This means that out of 100 samples drawn in the same manner, we would expect 95 to yield results within the specified error range.

The survey had an overall response rate of 52 percent. Compared to the 2000 Census for the city as a whole, the survey over represents respondents in the "Other" category, which includes Asian/Pacific Islander, American Indian/Eskimo, and Hispanic respondents.

Comparison of Survey Respondent Demographics to  
2000 Census - Gender

	Male	Female
Census	47.6%	52.4%
2003 Survey	45.0%	55.0%

Sources: ETC Institute DirectionFinder Survey 2003 and  
Census 2000 Supplementary Survey Summary Tables.

Comparison of Survey Respondent Demographics to  
2000 Census - Race

	White	Black/African American	Other
Census	59.6%	35.4%	5.0%
2003 Survey	55.6%	35.0%	9.3%

Sources: ETC Institute DirectionFinder Survey 2003 and  
Census 2000 Supplementary Survey Summary Tables.

We report 2003 survey results compared to results from the two previous years, which the ETC Institute conducted in November 2001 and October 2002. These surveys also had overall 95 percent confidence levels and margins of error up to +/- 3 percent. Small differences between responses on the surveys could be due to sampling error. We note changes that are statistically significant.

For some survey questions, we provide benchmarking data from 19 other communities in the Kansas City metropolitan area and twelve other large cities – Arlington, Dallas, Denver, Fort Worth, Houston, Indianapolis, Minneapolis, Oklahoma City, San Antonio, St. Louis, Tulsa, and Wichita. ETC conducted citizen satisfaction surveys in these cities and in the metropolitan area between December 2001 and December 2003. The benchmarking data provide some context for interpreting survey results.

## Performance Indicators

The set of performance indicators we highlight in this report is not intended to be a complete set of performance measures for all users. We sought to limit the number of measures we report so the information is more accessible to the public and elected officials. Our focus is on a few critical measures in priority areas that are relevant to community conditions and citizen satisfaction.

Our objective was to consider performance information from a citizen's point of view rather than functional responsibility for service delivery. Therefore, responsibility for some of the service areas may overlap programs, departments, or jurisdictions.

An advisory panel of seven community representatives and two city staff assisted us in selecting performance indicators that focus on community conditions and program results. The panel met four times between September 14 and October 5, 2001, to discuss performance indicators that are central to quality of services or citizen satisfaction.

We selected indicators to report based on the panel's input and data availability. We compiled performance data for fiscal year 2003 and compared the results with the data we compiled last year.

Where possible, we verified data by reviewing how data are collected and recorded, reviewing computer programs or calculations, performing calculations, or seeking confirmation from other sources.

Where available, we report targets, standards, or goals for the measures. For example, we report some benchmarks from the International City/County Management Association (ICMA) Comparative Performance Measurement FY 2002 Data Report. But for the most part, we did not collect comparable data from other cities due to time constraints and the

difficulty of ensuring that data from other cities are reliable and comparable. This is our third City Services Performance Report.

We conducted this audit in accordance with generally accepted government auditing standards, with the exception of reporting the views of management concerning the audit. We sent a draft report to the City Manager and directors of affected departments for their review. No information was omitted from this report because it was deemed privileged or confidential.

---

## Background

Performance measurement encourages accountability by providing information regarding use of public resources. The Governmental Accounting Standards Board (GASB) has encouraged governments to publicly report performance data to provide more complete information about the results of programs than is available in a budget or financial statement. Accessible and reliable information about government performance allows the public to build trust and confidence in their public institutions. Accessible and reliable performance information also supports decision-making and an engaged citizenry.

Elected officials and citizens can use performance information to decide how well the city is providing services. Comparisons can be made between current information and:

- Previous year's performance
- Agency targets or goals
- Technically developed standards or norms
- Similar jurisdictions
- Citizen expectations
- Similar private sector organizations
- Among geographical areas or client groups

While the performance information is useful in telling us how the city is doing, it does not tell us why the city is doing well or poorly. Many factors including funding, weather, population density, and vague or conflicting program goals can influence outcomes.





---

## Results

---

### Summary of the 2003 Citizen Survey

---

Results of the 2003 citizen survey show little change from last year. About half (52 percent) of respondents rated their satisfaction with the overall quality of services provided by the city as a 4 or 5, where 5 means very satisfied. Over half (57 percent) rated their satisfaction with the overall quality of life in the city as a 4 or 5, where 5 means very satisfied.

Citizen satisfaction with the overall quality of local public health services and flow of traffic improved. However, while survey results show improvement in some areas, Kansas City residents continued to rate almost all services below the average of the other communities surveyed.

- 69 percent of respondents rated their satisfaction with the overall quality of the city's police, fire, and ambulance services as a 4 or 5, which is lower than the average metro area benchmarks, but consistent with the average of the other central US/regional large cities.
- 65 percent of respondents rated their satisfaction with the overall quality of city water and sewer utilities as a 4 or 5, which is higher than the average metro area benchmarks.
- 56 percent of respondents rated their satisfaction with the overall quality of the customer service in Kansas City as a 4 or 5, which is lower than the average metro area benchmarks.
- 55 percent of respondents rated their satisfaction with the overall quality of the city's park and recreation services as a 4 or 5, which is lower than the average metro area benchmarks and lower than the average of the other central US/regional large cities. The percent of "don't know" responses increased significantly for some of the questions related to parks.
- 48 percent of respondents rated their satisfaction with the enforcement of the city codes as a 4 or 5, which is slightly lower than the metro area average, but consistent with the average of the other central US/regional large cities.
- 46 percent of respondents rated their satisfaction with the city stormwater runoff system as a 4 or 5, which is slightly higher than the metro area average.
- 43 percent of respondents rated their satisfaction with the effectiveness of the city's communication with the public as a 4 or 5,

which is lower than the metro area average and a little lower than the average of the other central US/regional large cities.

- 21 percent of respondents rated their satisfaction with the maintenance of streets/buildings as a 4 or 5, which is much lower than the metro area average benchmarks and lower than all the other central US/regional large cities.

Maintenance has topped the list of areas that citizens think should receive the most emphasis over the next two years in both the 2002 and 2003 citizen surveys.

In the 2003 citizen survey, 72 percent of those surveyed selected overall maintenance of city streets, buildings and facilities among their top three choices for leaders to emphasize over the next two years – 48 percent selected maintenance as their top choice. About 10 percent of respondents selected public safety (police, fire, and ambulance) as their first choice. We also asked about priorities within service areas. Respondents selected maintenance of city streets and the smoothness of streets as the top maintenance priorities.


Citizen satisfaction with city leadership was also unchanged. Thirty-four percent of respondents rated their satisfaction with the overall quality of leadership provided by elected officials as a 4 or 5, where 5 means very satisfied. Thirty percent of respondents

rated the effectiveness of appointed boards as a 4 or 5; and 33 percent rated the overall effectiveness of the City Manager and appointed staff as a 4 or 5.

Most respondents (66 percent) continued to rate Kansas City as a good place to live. However, fewer respondents rated Kansas City as a good place to work, 57 percent compared to 66 percent in 2002. Respondents did not rate Kansas City as a place to raise children quite as well, over half (52 percent) rated Kansas City as a 4 or 5 as a place to raise children where 5 means excellent.



Source: ETC Institute, 2003 DirectionFinder Survey.



Source: ETC Institute, 2003 DirectionFinder Survey.

## Overall Priorities


Which three of these items do you think should receive the most emphasis from city leaders over the next two years?

	2002				2003			
	First choice	Second choice	Third choice	In Top Three	First choice	Second Choice	Third choice	In Top Three
Overall maintenance of city streets, buildings and facilities	36%	15%	11%	62%	48%	18%	7%	72%
Overall flow of traffic	8%	10%	17%	36%	6%	11%	11%	28%
Overall enforcement of city codes and ordinances	5%	11%	8%	23%	5%	10%	8%	24%
Overall quality of the city's stormwater runoff/stormwater management system	6%	10%	10%	27%	5%	9%	10%	24%
Overall quality of police, fire, and ambulance services	11%	6%	5%	22%	10%	7%	5%	22%
Overall effectiveness of city communication with the public	5%	10%	13%	29%	3%	7%	12%	22%
Overall quality of city parks and recreation programs and facilities	9%	8%	6%	23%	6%	7%	6%	19%
Overall quality of city water utilities	4%	7%	5%	16%	5%	7%	4%	15%
Overall quality of customer service you receive from city employees	6%	10%	8%	23%	3%	6%	5%	13%
Overall quality of local public health services	4%	6%	7%	17%	2%	4%	6%	13%
Overall quality of city convention facilities *	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	1%	2%	4%	7%
Overall quality of airport facilities *	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	1%	1%	2%	5%
None selected	5%	7%	12%	5%	5%	12%	19%	5%

\*Asked for the first time in the 2003 survey.

Sources: ETC Institute DirectionFinder Surveys.

## Benchmarking Data on Citizens' Overall Satisfaction with Major Categories of Services



## Citizens' Overall Satisfaction with Major Categories of Services

	Very Satisfied (5)			4			3			2			Very Dissatisfied (1)			Don't Know		
How satisfied are you with:	Nov 01	Oct 02	Nov 03	Nov 01	Oct 02	Nov 03	Nov 01	Oct 02	Dec 03	Nov 01	Oct 02	Nov 03	Nov 01	Oct 02	Nov 03	Nov 01	Oct 02	Nov 03
Overall quality of police, fire, and ambulance services?	34%	30%	32%	35%	38%	33%	19%	20%	21%	5%	5%	5%	3%	4%	3%	3%	4%	6%
Overall quality of city parks and recreation programs and facilities?	21%	18%	18%	33%	32%	31%	25%	27%	26%	9%	11%	9%	4%	6%	5%	8%	<b>6%</b>	<b>12%</b>
Overall maintenance of city streets, buildings and facilities?	7%	8%	6%	16%	16%	15%	29%	27%	28%	27%	27%	28%	21%	23%	23%	<1%	<1%	1%
Overall quality of city water utilities?	27%	24%	25%	37%	38%	39%	20%	21%	21%	8%	9%	7%	5%	7%	6%	2%	2%	2%
Overall enforcement of city codes and ordinances?	15%	13%	15%	26%	29%	27%	29%	30%	25%	11%	12%	11%	8%	9%	9%	11%	<b>7%</b>	<b>12%</b>
Overall quality of customer service you receive from city employees?	20%	16%	20%	30%	31%	32%	26%	25%	24%	9%	13%	10%	7%	10%	7%	7%	5%	7%
Overall effectiveness of city communication with the public?	13%	10%	12%	30%	27%	28%	32%	33%	33%	14%	16%	13%	8%	10%	9%	3%	4%	5%
Overall quality of the city's stormwater runoff/stormwater management system?	12%	11%	14%	25%	29%	28%	29%	29%	26%	15%	14%	13%	10%	12%	10%	9%	<b>6%</b>	<b>10%</b>
Overall quality of local public health services?	<b>19%</b>	<b>14%</b>	<b>19%</b>	32%	32%	32%	24%	<b>27%</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>10%</b>	8%	4%	6%	5%	15%	<b>10%</b>	<b>16%</b>
Overall flow of traffic?	9%	9%	10%	30%	<b>26%</b>	<b>33%</b>	31%	31%	31%	<b>17%</b>	<b>22%</b>	<b>15%</b>	10%	11%	9%	2%	1%	2%

\*Bold indicates statistically significant changes at  $p < .05$   
 Sources: ETC Institute DirectionFinder Surveys.

---

## Streets

The Public Works Department maintains city streets, including resurfacing, patching potholes, clearing snow and ice, and cleaning roadside ditches. The department is also responsible for inspecting utility cuts, issuing traffic control and street closure permits, setting speed limits and intersection controls, and maintaining traffic signals and signs. Street services are primarily funded by city and state taxes. The city has about 5,900 lane miles of streets.



Public Works Department Expenditures (millions)  
and Authorized FTE

	2001	2002	2003
Expenditures	\$ 99.1	\$105.2	\$131.7
FTE	403.4	391.7	374.0

Sources: Adopted Budget 2004 and Submitted Budget 2005.



## Citizen Satisfaction Benchmarking Data



## Citizen Satisfaction with Streets

	Very Satisfied (5)			4			3			2			Very Dissatisfied (1)			Don't Know		
How satisfied are you with:	Nov 01	Oct 02	Nov 03	Nov 01	Oct 02	Nov 03	Nov 01	Oct 02	Nov 03	Nov 01	Oct 02	Nov 03	Nov 01	Oct 02	Nov 03	Nov 01	Oct 02	Nov 03
Maintenance of city streets?	4%	<b>6%</b>	<b>3%</b>	16%	15%	16%	25%	21%	25%	28%	29%	30%	25%	27%	25%	1%	1%	1%
Maintenance of streets in your neighborhood?	10%	10%	7%	23%	25%	22%	23%	<b>21%</b>	<b>26%</b>	22%	21%	23%	21%	21%	22%	1%	1%	<1%
Smoothness of city streets? **	n/a	n/a	3%	n/a	n/a	13%	n/a	n/a	28%	n/a	n/a	29%	n/a	n/a	28%	n/a	n/a	1%
Condition of sidewalks in the city?	6%	6%	4%	21%	19%	21%	29%	31%	29%	20%	24%	23%	17%	16%	18%	6%	4%	6%
Maintenance of street signs?	12%	13%	12%	38%	36%	42%	31%	31%	28%	11%	10%	10%	6%	6%	6%	3%	3%	2%
Maintenance of traffic signals?	16%	16%	16%	41%	44%	46%	29%	26%	24%	7%	8%	9%	4%	5%	5%	2%	2%	1%
Snow removal on major city streets?	<b>13%</b>	14%	<b>18%</b>	37%	<b>33%</b>	<b>39%</b>	25%	28%	25%	<b>13%</b>	<b>13%</b>	<b>9%</b>	10%	9%	7%	2%	4%	2%
Snow removal on streets in residential areas?	6%	8%	6%	<b>16%</b>	<b>24%</b>	<b>21%</b>	24%	27%	28%	<b>26%</b>	<b>19%</b>	23%	<b>25%</b>	<b>17%</b>	21%	2%	4%	2%
Mowing and tree trimming along city streets and other public areas?	10%	10%	10%	31%	30%	33%	31%	32%	31%	16%	16%	13%	10%	9%	10%	2%	3%	3%
Overall cleanliness of city streets and other public areas?	7%	7%	6%	29%	<b>25%</b>	<b>31%</b>	36%	37%	37%	17%	20%	17%	9%	10%	9%	1%	2%	1%
Adequacy of city street lighting?	22%	19%	19%	41%	<b>37%</b>	<b>45%</b>	23%	24%	24%	9%	<b>12%</b>	<b>8%</b>	4%	6%	4%	1%	2%	1%

\*Bold indicates statistically significant changes at  $p < .05$

\*\*New question.

Sources: ETC Institute DirectionFinder Surveys.

## Maintenance Priorities

Which two of these maintenance items do you think should receive the most emphasis from city leaders over the next two years?

	First choice	2002 Second Choice	In Top Two	First choice	2003 Second Choice	In Top Two
Maintenance of city streets	35%	9%	44%	30%	12%	42%
Smoothness of city streets **	n/a	n/a	n/a	13%	16%	29%
Snow removal on streets in residential areas	7%	12%	19%	10%	13%	23%
Maintenance of streets in your neighborhood	8%	15%	23%	10%	11%	21%
Maintenance of sidewalks in the city	6%	9%	15%	6%	7%	13%
Maintenance and preservation of downtown Kansas City, MO	9%	7%	16%	6%	5%	11%
Timeliness of the removal of abandoned cars from public property	5%	8%	12%	6%	4%	10%
Overall cleanliness of city streets and other public areas	6%	11%	17%	3%	6%	9%
Mowing and tree trimming along city streets and other public areas	4%	4%	8%	2%	4%	6%
Snow removal on major city streets	4%	4%	8%	3%	2%	5%
Overall quality of trash collection services	3%	4%	7%	2%	3%	5%
Adequacy of city street lighting	4%	6%	9%	2%	2%	4%
Maintenance of street signs	1%	2%	3%	1%	1%	3%
Maintenance of traffic signals	2%	2%	3%	2%	2%	3%
Maintenance of city buildings, such as City Hall	2%	3%	4%	1%	1%	2%
None selected	6%	7%	6%	6%	9%	6%

\*\*This activity was not used in the 2002 survey.

Sources: ETC Institute 2002 and 2003 DirectionFinder Surveys.

---

## Street Services Performance Indicators

### Street Condition

We report the percent of asphalt arterial streets with potholes, cracks, and bumps or depressions. The Public Works Department assessed the condition of a sample of the city's streets in 2001, 2002, and 2003. The sample was randomly selected to represent streets in the north, south, and middle parts of the city. We report the results for asphalt streets, which make up 97 percent of the city's streets (2 percent are concrete and 1 percent are unpaved).

#### Street District Boundaries

District 1: all of the city north of the Missouri River.

District 2: from the Missouri River south to the Plaza (47<sup>th</sup> Street/Blue Parkway/55<sup>th</sup> Street).

District 3: from the District 2 southern boundary to the city's south border.

Streets failed the assessment criteria if they had:

- potholes more than one square foot in area and more than one inch deep
- unsealed cracking over ¼ inch wide and 25 feet long in primary or secondary asphalt arterial roads or more than 100 feet long on local asphalt roads
- unsealed alligator cracking (a network of cracks that form areas of pavement that are roughly

rectangular or triangular) more than 125 square feet in area

- depressions or bumps (abrupt changes in the pavement) more than 1 inch deep or high in asphalt streets or more than 2 inches deep or high in concrete streets

Ten percent of Kansas City streets are designated as state or federal highways and maintenance is the responsibility of the Missouri Department of Transportation (MODOT). These streets are not included in the street condition assessment, but may influence citizens' perceptions of the quality of street maintenance, traffic flow, etc.

**Why is it important?** Pavement condition is a measure of how well the city is maintaining its streets. Poorly maintained streets contribute to ride roughness, accidents, costs, delays, and negative citizen perceptions. People often complain about potholes and metal plates on the streets. Street maintenance has had one of the lowest citizen satisfaction ratings and satisfaction is declining – 55 percent of respondents in 2003 rated their satisfaction as a 1 or a 2, where 1 means very dissatisfied. Citizens' overall satisfaction with maintenance was the lowest among other large cities in the central United States and other cities in the metropolitan area. Respondents identified maintenance (of city streets, buildings, and facilities) and traffic flow as the top two city services that should receive emphasis over the next two years.

Maintenance and smoothness of city streets topped the list of maintenance-related items that respondents said city leaders should emphasize most over the next two years.

**How is the city doing?** Cracking is a problem in the city's streets. Roughly a third of the sampled arterial streets in the central and in the south area of the city failed the assessment criteria for cracks. The proportion of streets failing this criteria is as high as 50 percent north of the Missouri river. Roads in the southern part of the city (District 3) are in better shape than in the north and central districts. The percentage of arterial streets failing the potholes criteria increased markedly since 2001 in all three districts.

Percent of Arterial Streets Failing Assessment Criteria by Street District

	2001	2002	2003
<b>Potholes</b>			
District 1	8%	3%	10%
District 2	6%	2%	9%
District 3	0%	1%	4%
<b>Cracks</b>			
District 1	58%	35%	50%
District 2	40%	36%	34%
District 3	9%	24%	27%
<b>Bumps/Depressions</b>			
District 1	14%	5%	15%
District 2	8%	5%	26%
District 3	2%	2%	9%

Sources: Public Works, KC 2001, 2002, and 2003 Street Assessments.

More than half of local roads north of the river failed the criteria for cracks. The percentage of local streets failing the bumps/depressions criteria increased markedly since 2001 in all three districts.

Percent of Local Streets Failing Assessment Criteria by Street District<sup>1</sup>

	2001	2003
<b>Potholes</b>		
District 1	9%	8%
District 2	6%	9%
District 3	1%	3%
<b>Cracks</b>		
District 1	42%	51%
District 2	41%	39%
District 3	44%	33%
<b>Bumps/Depressions</b>		
District 1	13%	24%
District 2	10%	29%
District 3	2%	10%

Sources: Public Works, KC 2001 and 2003 Street Assessment.

## Street Safety

We report the number of accidents occurring at intersections and midblocks over a three-year period and the number of intersections and midblocks with relatively high accident rates<sup>2</sup>. The accident rate measures the number of accidents per 1 million vehicles

<sup>1</sup> Data for 2002 are not available.

<sup>2</sup> A midblock is a section of street 50 feet or more from the cross street.

entering an intersection or block. To provide perspective, about 1 million vehicles move through the intersection at Broadway and 5th Street every two weeks. This is one of the city's busiest intersections. The Public Works Department compiled and analyzed accident data from police daily accident reports covering 2000 through 2002.

**Why is it important?** Traffic accidents result in property damage, injuries, and fatalities. Traffic accidents are an indicator of street safety, although many other factors, such as weather and driver error or inattention, cause accidents. Analyzing accident data helps to identify unsafe locations where the city could take action to improve traffic safety, such as changing traffic controls.

**How is the city doing?** Public Works identified 206 intersections and 281 midblocks with relatively high numbers of accidents between 2000 and 2002. Among these locations, 30 intersections and 11 midblocks had high accident rates based on traffic volume. Overall, an average of about 16,400 accidents were reported each year, about 45 per day.

Between 2000 and 2002, an average of about 9,814 accidents per year were reported at nearly 5,048 intersections, about one-third of the city's intersections. There were 10 or more collisions per year at 206 intersections<sup>3</sup>.

<sup>3</sup> The Public Works Department used 10 or more collisions as the criterion for a high number of intersection accidents based on the cumulative frequency curve. The average number of accidents per intersection was 1.87.

Among these high accident intersections, accident rates ranged from less than 1 to over 5 accidents per 1 million vehicles entering the intersection – 30 of the 206 intersections had accident rates of 3 or higher.

Between 2000 and 2002, about 6,600 accidents per year were reported at about 8,800 midblock sections. The number of accidents was relatively high at 281 blocks<sup>4</sup>. Among these high accident blocks, accident rates ranged from about 2 to 141 accidents per 1 million vehicle-miles of travel – 11 of the 281 blocks had accident rates of 30 or higher.

**Number of Intersections with High Number and Rate of Accidents between 2000 and 2002**

Intersections with high number of accidents	Intersections with a high accident rate
206	30

Sources: Public Works Department, Intersection Experiencing 10 or More Collisions Per Year (2000-2002).

**Number of Midblocks with High Number and Rate of Accidents between 2000 and 2002**

Midblocks with high number of accidents	Midblocks with a high accident rate
281	11

Sources: Public Works Department, Midblock Accident Statistics, Based on Three Years Data (2000-2002).

<sup>4</sup> The Public Works Department used 3 accidents per year as the criteria for a high number of midblock accidents based on the cumulative frequency curves. The average number of accidents per midblock was 0.75 (0.82 for North-South Sections and 0.68 for East-West sections).

Intersections with 3 or More Accidents Per Million Vehicles

Intersection	Rate
E 18th St & Walnut St	5.37
Independence Av and Paseo	4.65
E 24th St and Van Brunt Blvd	4.61
E Gregory Blvd and James A. Reed Rd	4.53
E 75th St and Troost Av	4.52
E 87th St and Hillcrest Rd	4.32
Independence Av and Van Brunt Blvd	4.25
E 27th St and Prospect Av	4.13
E 31st St and Prospect Av	4.05
E 39th St and Troost Av	3.78
E 14th St and Walnut St	3.53
E 9th St and Hardesty Av	3.49
Pennsylvania Av and W 39th St	3.40
E Truman Rd and Main St (N. Drive)	3.38
E 9th St and Prospect Av	3.30
Southwest Tfwy and Westport Rd	3.25
E Truman Rd and Paseo	3.23
E 8th St and Grand Av	3.22
Brooklyn Av and E 31st St	3.21
Admiral Blvd and Paseo	3.18
E 31st St and Gillham Plz	3.17
E 31st St and Jackson Av	3.17
Benton Blvd and E 18th St	3.13
E Truman Rd and Hardesty Av	3.13
E 39th St and Prospect Av	3.12
Hardesty Av and Independence Av	3.09
E 12th St and Oak Tfwy	3.07
E Truman Rd (S. Drive) and Walnut St	3.02
E 39th St and Indiana Av	3.01
E 12th St and Hardesty Av	3.00

Sources: Public Works Department, Intersections Experiencing 10 or More Collisions per Year (2000-2002).

Midblocks with 30 or More Accidents Per Million Vehicle-Miles of Travel

Street Name (Nearest Cross Street)	Rate
Pennsylvania Ave (W 40th Street)	141.00
62nd Terr (Main Street)	135.61
Cypress (E 24th Street)	109.59
Bell (E 39th Street)	60.88
Pennsylvania Ave (Westport Rd)	50.64
Little Blue (George Ave)	45.20
Westport (Bridger Rd)	38.72
12th Street (Fremont Ave)	37.31
Independence Ave (Topping Ave)	34.36
46th Street (Lexington Ave)	31.20
Mill (Westport Rd)	30.08

Sources: Public Works Department, Midblocks Experiencing 10 or More Collisions per Year (2000-2002).

**Snow removal**

We had planned to report how Public Works met its goals of snow removal. Public Work's goal was to clear arterial streets and boulevards within 12 hours of the end of the storm and clear residential streets within 48 hours in fiscal years 2001 and 2002. Currently, the goal is to clear arterial streets to bare pavement within 12 hours of the end of a snow storm. On residential roads, the goal is to make one pass of every residential street within 12 hours of the end of the snow storm. The department does not attempt to remove the snow on residential streets to bare pavement.

**Why is it important?** Snow removal affects people's ability to travel safely through city streets. While citizen satisfaction with snow removal on major streets improved this year – about 57 percent rated their satisfaction as a 4 or 5, where 5 means very satisfied,

citizens are less satisfied with snow removal on residential streets compared with 2002. About 27 percent of survey respondents rated their satisfaction with snow removal on residential city streets as a 4 or 5, where 5 means very satisfied. Citizen satisfaction with snow removal is below the average for other cities in the metropolitan area.

**How is the city doing?** Data are not available. While department staff expect they routinely meet their goals, they do not record when the snow ends to assess how often their goals are achieved. Instead, the department records miles driven on a route, salt used, and total calls requesting additional services.

### Street cleanliness

We report the percent of streets failing the Street Condition Assessment Survey criteria for curb dirt and debris. Arterial streets failed the assessment criteria if they had accumulation of dirt more than 2 inches deep and more than 3 square feet in area and/or debris (large pieces of material, such as tree limbs, tires, and large rocks that cause water to flow outside the gutter flowline).

**Why is it important?** Debris in the streets can be a hazard to street safety and block the gutters and storm inlets, increasing the risk of flooding. Debris also affects people's perceptions of city streets. Citizens report a relatively low level of satisfaction with the overall cleanliness of city streets and public areas – 37 percent of respondents in 2003 rated their satisfaction as a 1 or 2, where 1 means very dissatisfied. Citizens' overall satisfaction with the cleanliness of city streets

and public areas is below the average for other cities in the metropolitan area.

**How is the city doing?** Cleanliness of city streets has worsened since 2001. More local streets failed the criteria in dirt and debris at curbs than arterial streets. One third of sampled streets in the central part of the city failed the assessment criteria. Overall, 20 percent of city streets failed the criteria.

Percent of Streets Failing Dirt and Debris at Curbs  
Criteria

		2001	2002	2003
District 1	Arterial	9%	9%	16%
	Local <sup>5</sup>	11%		23%
District 2	Arterial	9%	15%	31%
	Local	25%		30%
District 3	Arterial	0%	8%	7%
	Local	18%		13%
Citywide		15%		20%

Sources: Public Works, KC 2001, 2002, and 2003 Street Assessments.

<sup>5</sup> Data for 2002 are not available for local streets.





## Public Safety

The Police and Fire departments and Metropolitan Ambulance Services Trust (MAST) are the city's major providers of public safety services.

- The Police Department responds to 911 calls for service, provides police patrol and community policing, investigates crimes, and compiles evidence for prosecutions. In fiscal year 2003, the Police Department responded to over 311,000 calls.
- The Fire Department responds to fires, medical emergencies, and other dangerous situations. The department also promotes fire safety through public education and enforcement of the city's fire code. In fiscal year 2003 the department responded to about 38,700 emergency incidents.
- The city contracts with MAST to provide paramedic and ambulance services. During fiscal year 2003, MAST was responsible for contracting for ambulance service delivery through competitive bidding, monitoring ambulance service, and handling billing and collections. Most of MAST's revenue is from patient billing. In March 2003, the City Council authorized MAST to incorporate as a not-for-profit organization and in July 2003, MAST took over the ambulance operation. The City Council recently authorized MAST to operate the ambulance system through June 30, 2005. The city budgeted \$5.6 million for MAST in fiscal year 2004.

Police Department Expenditures (millions)  
and Authorized FTE

	2001	2002	2003
Expenditures	\$126.3	\$132.2	\$140.5
FTE	1972.0	2026.4	2042.9

Sources: Adopted Budget 2002-2004,  
Submitted Budget 2005.

Fire Department Expenditures (millions)  
and Authorized FTE

	2001	2002	2003
Expenditures	\$66.5	\$71.3	\$75.6
FTE	866.1	866.1	893.9



Sources: Adopted Budget 2002-2004,  
Submitted Budget 2005.

MAST Expenditures (millions) and Authorized  
FTE

	2001	2002	2003
Expenditures	\$38.4	\$40.3	\$39.4
MAST FTE	38.0	36.0	40.0

Source: MAST Statement of Revenues, Expenses,  
and Changes in Net Assets, years ended April 30.  
2001, 2002, and 2003.

## Benchmarking Data



## Citizen Satisfaction with Public Safety

	Very Satisfied (5)			4			3			2			Very Dissatisfied (1)			Don't Know		
How satisfied are you with:	Nov 01	Oct 02	Nov 03	Nov 01	Oct 02	Dec 03	Nov 01	Oct 02	Nov 03	Nov 01	Oct 02	Nov 03	Nov 01	Oct 02	Nov 03	Nov 01	Oct 02	Nov 03
Overall quality of local police protection?	20%	19%	17%	39%	37%	38%	24%	24%	24%	10%	12%	12%	5%	6%	6%	2%	2%	2%
The visibility of police in neighborhoods?	18%	15%	16%	32%	33%	34%	25%	27%	27%	15%	16%	14%	9%	8%	8%	1%	1%	1%
The visibility of police in retail areas?	15%	13%	14%	31%	32%	33%	33%	31%	29%	12%	15%	15%	4%	6%	4%	4%	3%	5%
The city's overall efforts to prevent crime?	13%	11%	14%	34%	33%	33%	32%	31%	30%	12%	15%	13%	5%	7%	6%	4%	3%	5%
Enforcement of local traffic laws?	15%	15%	19%	36%	35%	34%	28%	29%	28%	11%	12%	10%	7%	6%	6%	3%	2%	4%
Overall quality of local fire protection?	35%	<b>30%</b>	<b>38%</b>	44%	39%	41%	13%	17%	13%	<b>1%</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>2%</b>	1%	4%	1%	6%	5%	6%
Quality of local ambulance service?	27%	<b>24%</b>	<b>31%</b>	38%	37%	36%	15%	19%	15%	<b>4%</b>	<b>8%</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>2%</b>	4%	2%	<b>14%</b>	<b>8%</b>	<b>14%</b>
How quickly public safety personnel respond to emergencies?	22%	21%	26%	35%	32%	33%	20%	22%	19%	7%	9%	7%	<b>4%</b>	<b>8%</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>12%</b>	<b>8%</b>	<b>13%</b>
Quality of animal control?	13%	12%	13%	29%	29%	30%	27%	28%	26%	12%	15%	13%	9%	9%	8%	10%	7%	10%
City efforts to enhance fire protection?	20%	18%	21%	37%	36%	36%	23%	25%	21%	<b>5%</b>	<b>9%</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>14%</b>	<b>7%</b>	<b>16%</b>
The city's municipal court?	10%	13%	11%	26%	26%	25%	27%	27%	25%	6%	9%	7%	<b>4%</b>	<b>7%</b>	6%	<b>27%</b>	<b>19%</b>	<b>26%</b>

\*Bold indicates statistically significant changes at  $p < .05$

Sources: ETC Institute DirectionFinder Surveys.

## Citizen Satisfaction with Public Safety (continued)

	Very safe (5)			4			3			2			Very unsafe (1)			Don't Know		
How safe do you feel in the following situations:	Nov 01	Oct 02	Nov 03	Nov 01	Oct 02	Nov 03	Nov 01	Oct 02	Nov 03	Nov 01	Oct 02	Nov 03	Nov 01	Oct 02	Nov 03	Nov 01	Oct 02	Nov 03
At home during the day?	<b>49%</b>	<b>43%</b>	41%	36%	37%	39%	11%	12%	12%	<b>2%</b>	<b>5%</b>	4%	1%	2%	2%	<1%	1%	1%
At home at night?	<b>34%</b>	<b>28%</b>	30%	37%	37%	38%	18%	20%	19%	8%	10%	8%	3%	4%	5%	<1%	1%	1%
In your neighborhood during the day?	<b>46%</b>	<b>39%</b>	39%	36%	38%	39%	12%	14%	15%	<b>3%</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>3%</b>	2%	2%	3%	<1%	1%	1%
In your neighborhood at night?	<b>28%</b>	<b>22%</b>	23%	35%	32%	34%	20%	23%	22%	<b>10%</b>	<b>14%</b>	11%	6%	7%	8%	<1%	1%	1%
In city parks during the day?	21%	19%	17%	34%	32%	32%	<b>21%</b>	<b>26%</b>	<b>20%</b>	6%	9%	7%	5%	4%	5%	12%	10%	19%
In city parks at night?	3%	5%	4%	<b>8%</b>	<b>12%</b>	<b>7%</b>	19%	<b>19%</b>	<b>14%</b>	22%	24%	18%	32%	29%	30%	<b>16%</b>	<b>12%</b>	<b>27%</b>

\*Bold indicates statistically significant changes at  $p < .05$

Sources: ETC Institute DirectionFinder Surveys.

## Public Safety Priorities

Which two of these public safety items do you think should receive the most emphasis from city leaders over the next two years?

	2002			2003		
	First choice	Second Choice	In Top Two	First choice	Second Choice	In Top Two
Overall quality of local police protection	18%	7%	25%	21%	9%	30%
The visibility of police in neighborhoods	19%	10%	28%	17%	12%	29%
The city's overall efforts to prevent crime	11%	16%	28%	15%	15%	29%
Quality of animal control	10%	10%	20%	8%	11%	19%
The visibility of police in retail areas	7%	9%	16%	7%	10%	17%
Enforcement of local traffic laws	8%	9%	17%	7%	9%	16%
The city's municipal court	4%	8%	12%	5%	5%	10%
How quickly public safety personnel respond to emergencies	9%	8%	16%	3%	6%	9%
Quality of local ambulance service	3%	4%	7%	3%	4%	7%
Overall quality of local fire protection and rescue services	4%	5%	8%	3%	2%	5%
The city's efforts to enhance fire protection	3%	6%	9%	2%	2%	4%
None selected	6%	8%	6%	9%	15%	9%

Sources: ETC Institute 2002 and 2003 DirectionFinder Surveys.

## Public Safety Performance Indicators

### Time to answer 911 calls

In 2002 we reported the percent of 911 calls answered within 12 and 24 seconds, about 3 to 6 rings, from the Police Department's phone system report. City code sets a performance standard for answering 90 percent of 911 emergency telephone calls within 18 seconds.<sup>6</sup> However, the Police Department's phone system report did not measure calls answered within this interval.

**Why is it important?** The 911 system is the starting point for people to access emergency services. We found in our performance audit of the emergency medical services system that 911 call taking was sometimes a bottleneck.<sup>7</sup> When all call takers are on a line, callers hear a recording telling them to stay on the line or call MAST or the Fire Department directly.

**How is the city doing?** The Police Department has not been able to measure the time to answer 911 calls since it used a new telephone system in fiscal year 2002. The new phone system can not differentiate between a call answered by a calltaker and a recorded message that answers when all lines are busy. According to the Police Department, they have requested software upgrades from the 911 telephone call provider. However, it does not

---

<sup>6</sup> Code of Ordinances, Kansas City, Missouri, Section 34-372(a).

<sup>7</sup> *Performance Audit: Emergency Medical Services System*, Office of the City Auditor, Kansas City, Missouri, January 2000, p. 34.

appear that this will be accomplished in the near future. In fiscal year 2001, the department answered 71.7 percent of calls within 12 seconds and 79.2 percent of calls within 24 seconds.

### Police Response Time

We report the average time for police to respond to priority 1 and priority 2 calls. The Police Department measures response time from the time the call taker receives the call until the first unit arrives on the scene. Response time does not include time to answer the 911 call. Start and stop times are recorded in whole minutes that have been converted to hundredths of an hour.<sup>8</sup>

**Why is it important?** Response time measures how quickly police can respond to emergencies. Though there is not a strong connection between response time and crime deterrence or resolution of reported incidents, response time remains one of the most popular measures of police patrol effectiveness nationwide. Compared to other communities in the metropolitan area, citizen satisfaction with the quality of local police protection and how quickly public safety personnel respond (including police, fire and ambulance) was below average. About 59 percent of respondents in

---

<sup>8</sup> This conversion affects the precision of response time calculations. Individual response times can be off by up to 83 seconds in either direction. However, the average response time is accurate if the start and stop times are normally distributed.

2003 rated their satisfaction with how quickly public safety personnel respond to emergencies as a 4 or 5, where 5 means very satisfied. The department responds to urgent calls with lights and sirens. Urgent calls include most Priority 1 calls, and Priority 2 or 3 calls under some circumstances such as the presence of the suspect at or near the scene, the potential destruction of evidence, and when incidents are of great magnitude.

**Priority 1:**

Assist the officer	Injury accident
Robbery	Explosion
Suspicious party armed	Ambulance
Rape in progress	Shooting
Nature unknown	Hold-up alarm
Explosive device	Cutting
Disaster	

**Priority 2:**

Strong-arm robbery	Dead body
Prowler	Meet the officer
Fire	Disturbance (other than noise)
Bomb threat	Domestic violence
Assault	assault

Source: Police Department.

**How is the city doing?** Average response times for priority 1 calls increased and average response time for priority 2 calls improved in fiscal year 2003, while the number of dispatches for which response time was measured decreased. The department does not have a formal target for response time; its goal is continuous improvement.

### Average Police Response Time, Fiscal Years 2002 and 2003

	Priority 1		Priority 2	
	FY02	FY03	FY02	FY03
Time (min:sec)	10:59	11:03	13:54	13:39
No. of Dispatches	27,319	25,795	92,141	87,938
Percent to Total Calls	9.6%	8.3%	32.4%	28.2%

Source: KCPD Monthly Performance Report.

Average response time was shortest in the Central Patrol division, and longest in the North Patrol division. The East Patrol division had the highest number of priority 1 and 2 dispatches in fiscal year 2003.

### Average Response Time Priority 1 Dispatches by Patrol Division

Patrol Division	Time (min:sec)	No. of Dispatches	Time (min:sec)	No. of Dispatches
	FY 2002		FY 2003	
East	10:58	8,239	11:05	7,813
Central	9:23	8,498	9:24	7,577
Metro	10:10	5,550	10:22	5,155
South	11:26	2,559	11:21	2,486
North	12:58	2,473	13:01	2,764

Source: KCPD Monthly Performance Report.

### Average Response Time Priority 2 Dispatches by Patrol Division

Patrol Division	Time (min:sec)	No. of Dispatches	Time (min:sec)	No. of Dispatches
	FY 2002		FY 2003	
East	13:46	29,113	13:45	27,401
Central	12:22	24,342	11:32	22,725
Metro	12:38	20,262	12:09	19,531
South	14:16	8,828	14:09	8,720
North	16:27	9,596	16:40	9,561

Source: KCPD Monthly Performance Report.



## Clearance rates

We report clearance rates for Part 1 and Part 2 offenses. The clearance rate is the total number of offenses cleared by arrest or exceptional circumstances during a fiscal year divided by the total number of reported offenses in that same fiscal year.<sup>9</sup>

One arrest may clear multiple offenses, and may be counted in each category of offense. Multiple arrests clearing a single offense are reported as a single clearance. The department counts exceptional clearances, where circumstances preclude arrests, in the clearance rate. Examples include the death of the offender, confession by an offender already in custody or serving a sentence, and minor juvenile offenses. The department reports clearance rates to the Board of Police Commissioners and the Missouri Highway Patrol, who in turn reports them to the FBI.

**Part 1 Offenses:** Murder, non-negligent manslaughter, forcible rape, robbery, aggravated assault, burglary, larceny (stealing), auto theft, and arson.

**Part 2 Offenses:** Non-aggravated assault, forgery, counterfeiting, fraud, embezzlement, vandalism, sex offenses, and all others.

Source: Uniform Crime Reporting Handbook.

<sup>9</sup> Clearance rate is defined by the FBI's Uniform Crime Reporting (UCR) program, which compiles crime statistics reported by law enforcement agencies nationwide.

**Why is it important?** The clearance rate provides information about how well the Police Department investigates cases and identifies and captures suspects.

**How is the city doing?** The department's clearance rates for Part 1 crimes improved in fiscal year 2002 and 2003 compared to fiscal year 2001. However, Kansas City's clearance rates are still lower than the fiscal year 2002 ICMA average for cities reporting with over 100,000 population – the average for these cities was 48.3 percent for part 1 violent crimes and 17.8 percent for part 1 property crimes.<sup>10</sup> Kansas City reported a clearance rate of 30.4 percent for part 1 violent crimes and 10.1 percent for part 1 property crimes in fiscal year 2003.

### Percent of Offenses Cleared by Arrest

Sources:		Percent of Offenses Cleared by Arrest			ICMA 2002
		2001	2002	2003	
KC PD Monthly Performance and	Part 1 Violent Crimes	24.9%	29.1%	30.4%	48.3%
	Part 1 Property Crimes	9.3%	9.8%	10.1%	17.8%
	Part 2 Crimes	31.5%	36.8%	36.1%	

Source: Kansas City Police Department and ICMA Comparative Performance Measurement FY2002 Data Report.

<sup>10</sup> Comparative Performance Measurement FY2001 Data Report, p. 419.

The number of reported part 1 violent and property crimes decreased by 8.9 percent and 9.3 in fiscal year 2003, respectively. The reported part 2 crimes also went down about 9.7 in fiscal year 2003.

#### Number of Reported Offenses by Fiscal Year

	2001	2002	2003
Part 1 Violent Crimes	7,178	6,669	6,073
Part 1 Property Crimes	41,989	42,051	38,101
Part 2 Crimes	18,998	18,067	17,156

Sources: KCPD Monthly Performance Report.

#### Number of officers and civilian staff

We report the number of authorized sworn officers and civilian full time employees per 1,000 population. ‘Authorized’ refers to the number of budgeted police positions, regardless of whether they are filled. ‘Sworn’ officers, as distinguished from civilian staff, are those with general power to make arrests. We report the number of positions per 1,000 population to allow for comparisons with other cities.

**Why is it important?** Staffing affects the department’s ability to provide services.

**How is the city doing?** Kansas City increased its authorized law enforcement positions by 29 in fiscal year 2003 to a total of 1,326 – for 3.00 authorized sworn officers per 1,000 residents. Cities with populations greater than 100,000 that reported to ICMA averaged 2.09 sworn officers per 1,000 population. Kansas City added 39 civilian employees to account for an average of 1.45 per 1,000 residents. Fifty-one percent of citizen respondents rated their satisfaction with the visibility of

police in neighborhoods as a 4 or 5, where 5 means very satisfied, while 22 percent expressed dissatisfaction.

#### Police Department Employees per 1,000 Residents

	2001	2002	2003	ICMA 2002
Authorized officers per 1,000 residents	2.97	2.94	3.00	2.09
Civilian FTEs per 1,000 residents	1.50	1.37	1.45	0.73

Sources: Police Department Appropriated Budgets 2002-2004; U.S. Census; and ICMA Comparative Performance Measurement FY 2002 Data Report.

#### Fire response time

We report the percent of Fire Department responses to emergency calls (fires, overpressure ruptures, hazardous conditions, EMS, and rescue) within five-minutes. The Fire Department measures response time from the time a unit is dispatched to the time it arrives on the scene. This measure of response time does not include time in the 911 system or the time to dispatch a call.

**Why is it important?** Response time measures how quickly fire companies can respond to emergencies. Quick response can help reduce fire damage and save lives. City code sets a response time standard of five minutes or less 90 percent of the time for life threatening EMS calls.<sup>11</sup>

<sup>11</sup> Code of Ordinances, Section 34-371(b).

Compared to other communities in the metropolitan area, citizen satisfaction with the quality of local fire protection was about the average and how quickly public safety personnel respond (including police, fire and ambulance) was below average. Satisfaction with fire protection has improved from 2002 to 2003. About 80 percent of respondents in 2003 rated their satisfaction with the quality of local fire protection and rescue services as a 4 or 5, where 5 means very satisfied. About 59 percent of respondents in 2003 rated their satisfaction with how quickly public safety personnel respond to emergencies as a 4 or 5, where 5 means very satisfied.

**How is the city doing?** The Fire Department responded to emergencies within 5 minutes about 75 percent of the time in fiscal year 2003 and 74 percent in fiscal year 2002. The Fire Department's percent of responses within 5 minutes is better than the ICMA average of about 68 percent for cities with populations of 100,000 or more.<sup>12</sup>

<sup>12</sup> ICMA Comparative Performance Measurement, 2002 Data Report, p. 144.

#### Percent of Fire Department Emergency Responses Within 5 minutes

	2001	2002	2003	ICMA 2002
Number of Calls	40,584	40,677	38,716	-----
% under 5 min.	72.1%	73.7%	74.8%	67.8%

Sources: KCFD Fractile Time Reports, and ICMA Comparative Performance Measurement FY 2002 Data Report.

#### Number of structure fires

We report the number of structure fires in Kansas City. This category includes any fire incident inside a building or structure, whether or not there was structural damage to the building. The number of structure fire incidents comprises residential, commercial, and industrial structure fires.

**Why is it important?** The number of structure fires is a measure of demand for the Fire Department's services and a measure of the effectiveness of fire prevention efforts.

**How is the city doing?** The city reported 1,627 structure fires in fiscal year 2003. This is a decrease from 2,074 in fiscal year 2002. We have not assessed the reliability of the Fire Incident Reporting System because the city is installing a new computer aided dispatch and reporting system for public safety.

## Structure Fires

	2001	2002	2003
Total	2,047	2,074	1,627
No. per 100,000 population	463.6	469.7	368.5

Sources: Fire Department.

**Ambulance response time**

We report the percent of ambulance responses to priority 1 calls within the 8 minute, 59 second target. In fiscal year 2001 and 2002, MAST response time goal was 8 minutes and 30 seconds. The goal has changed to 8 minutes and 59 seconds since this fiscal year. City code requires an advanced life support unit to be on the scene within 9 minutes on 90 percent of all life threatening emergency calls.<sup>13</sup> MAST starts measuring response time from the moment the ambulance dispatcher answers the call. This measure of response time does not count the time it takes for the Police Department to answer and transfer the 911 call to the dispatcher.

**Why is it important?** Ambulance response times to calls for emergency assistance may affect patients' survival rates or degrees of injury. Also, response times are the primary measure MAST used to monitor performance of their contractor. Compared to other communities in the metropolitan area, citizen satisfaction with the quality of local ambulance service was close to the average and how quickly public safety personnel respond (including police, fire and ambulance) was below average. Satisfaction with ambulance service has improved compared to last year.

<sup>13</sup> Code of Ordinances, Section 34-371 (a).

About 66 percent of respondents (compared with 61% in 2002) rated their satisfaction with the quality of ambulance service as a 4 or 5, where 5 means very satisfied. The percent of respondents rating their satisfaction as a 1 or a 2, where 1 means very dissatisfied has decreased from 12 percent in 2002 to 5 percent in 2003.

**How is the city doing?** Ambulance response times are meeting MAST's citywide goal. However, number of calls meeting the citywide goal has dropped about 1 percent even though the goal is now less stringent.

Percent of Ambulance Code 1 Responses Meeting the Targets<sup>14</sup>

	2001	2002	2003
Number of Code 1 Calls	20,209	20,142	19,908
Percent within target	91.6%	91.9%	90.9%

Source: MAST.

<sup>14</sup> In 2001 and 2002, MAST was using 8 minutes and 30 seconds as the response time compliance goal. The goal has changed since this fiscal year. The current response time citywide compliance goal is 8 minutes and 59 seconds.



## Parks and Recreation

The Parks and Recreation Department's mission is to improve the quality of life by providing recreational, leisure, and aesthetic opportunities for all citizens, and by conserving and enhancing the environment. The department is responsible for maintaining about 9,400 acres of developed and undeveloped park land. Parks and Recreation facilities include:

- Over 200 parks
- 132 boulevards and parkway miles
- 105 tennis courts
- 10 community centers
- 5 golf courses



The department provides various other services including recreation and educational programs; plants and maintains floral displays; and provides tree trimming along boulevards and parkways, park land, and around streetlights, traffic lights, roadways, and sidewalks. Expenditures in fiscal year 2001 included nearly \$36 million to renovate and expand the Liberty Memorial. Expenditures in fiscal year 2002 included about \$17 million for clean-up after the January 2002 ice storm. Department staff was reduced in fiscal year 2003 as the city turned over management and staffing of the zoo to Friends of the Zoo.

### Parks and Recreation Department Expenditures (millions) and Authorized FTE

	2001	2002	2003
Expenditures	\$88.3	\$73.8	\$75.3
FTE	730.6	761.1	489.5

Sources: Adopted Budget 2003 and 2004, and Submitted Budget 2005.

## Citizen Satisfaction Benchmarking Data



## Citizen Satisfaction with Parks and Recreation

	Very Satisfied (5)			4			3			2			Very Dissatisfied (1)			Don't Know		
How satisfied are you with:	Nov 01	Oct 02	Nov 03	Nov 01	Oct 02	Nov 03	Nov 01	Oct 02	Nov 03	Nov 01	Oct 02	Nov 03	Nov 01	Oct 02	Nov 03	Nov 01	Oct 02	Nov 03
Maintenance of city parks?	16%	15%	14%	37%	32%	32%	25%	25%	27%	10%	<b>14%</b>	<b>8%</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>8%</b>	<b>5%</b>	8%	<b>6%</b>	<b>14%</b>
Maintenance of boulevards & parkways? **	n/a	n/a	12%	n/a	n/a	34%	n/a	n/a	29%	n/a	n/a	11%	n/a	n/a	4%	n/a	n/a	10%
Location of city parks? **	n/a	n/a	18%	n/a	n/a	35%	n/a	n/a	26%	n/a	n/a	6%	n/a	n/a	4%	n/a	n/a	12%
The number of city parks? ***	20%	18%	n/a	32%	33%	n/a	24%	22%	n/a	11%	13%	n/a	<b>4%</b>	<b>7%</b>	n/a	9%	7%	n/a
Walking and biking trails in the city?	10%	11%	10%	20%	19%	23%	26%	29%	25%	18%	20%	15%	10%	10%	8%	<b>16%</b>	<b>11%</b>	<b>19%</b>
Maintenance of community centers? **	n/a	n/a	10%	n/a	n/a	25%	n/a	n/a	25%	n/a	n/a	8%	n/a	n/a	3%	n/a	n/a	30%
City swimming pools?	5%	5%	7%	<b>11%</b>	<b>16%</b>	<b>15%</b>	25%	26%	23%	16%	18%	14%	12%	13%	8%	<b>31%</b>	<b>22%</b>	<b>33%</b>
City golf courses?	9%	9%	10%	<b>15%</b>	<b>23%</b>	<b>18%</b>	24%	21%	17%	<b>6%</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>7%</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>40%</b>	<b>30%</b>	<b>47%</b>
Outdoor athletic fields (i.e. baseball, soccer, and flag football)?	10%	11%	9%	23%	23%	26%	27%	<b>31%</b>	<b>24%</b>	10%	11%	7%	5%	7%	4%	<b>24%</b>	<b>16%</b>	<b>29%</b>
The city's youth athletic programs?	8%	10%	8%	17%	19%	18%	27%	26%	24%	<b>8%</b>	<b>13%</b>	<b>9%</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>9%</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>36%</b>	<b>24%</b>	<b>38%</b>
The city's adult athletic programs?	6%	8%	6%	14%	18%	17%	26%	26%	22%	<b>8%</b>	<b>14%</b>	<b>8%</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>9%</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>40%</b>	<b>26%</b>	<b>43%</b>
Other city recreation programs, such as classes, trips, and special events?	7%	8%	8%	18%	<b>22%</b>	<b>17%</b>	28%	28%	24%	<b>7%</b>	<b>12%</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>7%</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>37%</b>	<b>24%</b>	<b>41%</b>
Ease of registering for programs?	6%	9%	7%	16%	20%	18%	<b>27%</b>	<b>27%</b>	<b>22%</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>11%</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>7%</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>41%</b>	<b>27%</b>	<b>43%</b>
Reasonableness of fees charged for recreation programs?	6%	8%	7%	<b>16%</b>	<b>21%</b>	17%	<b>27%</b>	<b>27%</b>	<b>22%</b>	7%	<b>10%</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>7%</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>40%</b>	<b>27%</b>	<b>43%</b>

\*Bold indicates statistically significant changes at  $p < .05$

\*\*New question.

\*\*\*Question no longer asked.

Sources: ETC Institute DirectionFinder Surveys.



## Use of Parks and Recreation Facilities

During the past 12 months, approximately how many times did you or other members of your household visit any parks in Kansas City, Missouri?

	Nov 01	Oct 02	Nov 03
at least once a week	<b>15%</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>14%</b>
a few times a month	20%	16%	16%
monthly	<b>13%</b>	<b>9%</b>	<b>15%</b>
less than once a month	18%	16%	14%
seldom or never	<b>33%</b>	<b>48%</b>	<b>41%</b>

During the past 12 months, approximately how many times did you or other members of your household visit a park in Kansas City, Missouri that is near your home?

	Nov 01	Oct 02	Nov 03
at least once a week	<b>14%</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>14%</b>
a few times a month	17%	14%	15%
monthly	12%	10%	13%
less than once a month	16%	15%	14%
seldom or never	<b>39%</b>	<b>52%</b>	<b>46%</b>

During the past 12 months, approximately how many times did you or other members of your household use city recreation facilities, such as swimming pools, community centers, sports fields, or golf courses?

	Nov 01	Oct 02	Nov 03
at least once a week	9%	6%	10%
a few times a month	10%	10%	14%
monthly	8%	10%	10%
less than once a month	13%	11%	11%
seldom or never	60%	<b>63%</b>	<b>56%</b>

\*Bold indicates statistically significant changes at  $p < .05$

Sources: ETC Institute DirectionFinder Surveys.

## Parks and Recreation Priorities

Which two of these parks and recreation items do you think should receive the most emphasis from city leaders over the next two years?

	2002			2003		
	First choice	Second Choice	In Top Two	First choice	Second Choice	In Top Two
Maintenance of city parks	22%	8%	29%	19%	9%	27%
Walking and biking trails in the city	14%	9%	24%	12%	11%	23%
Maintenance of boulevards and parkways**	n/a	n/a	n/a	10%	9%	19%
City swimming pools	13%	11%	24%	9%	9%	17%
The city's youth athletic programs	8%	8%	16%	6%	6%	13%
The location of city parks**	n/a	n/a	n/a	5%	6%	11%
Maintenance of city community centers**	n/a	n/a	n/a	4%	5%	9%
The number of city parks***	7%	8%	16%	n/a	n/a	n/a
Fees that are charged for recreation programs	4%	9%	13%	3%	4%	7%
Outdoor athletic fields (i.e. baseball, soccer, and flag football)	5%	8%	12%	2%	5%	7%
The city's adult athletic programs	5%	6%	11%	2%	2%	4%
Other city recreation programs, such as classes, trips, and special events	3%	8%	11%	2%	2%	4%
Ease of registering for programs	3%	5%	8%	2%	3%	5%
City golf courses	3%	3%	6%	1%	2%	4%
None selected	13%	17%	13%	23%	29%	23%

\*\*This activity was not used in the 2002 survey.

\*\*\* This activity was not included in the 2003 survey.

Sources: ETC Institute 2002 and 2003 DirectionFinder Surveys.

## Parks and Recreation Performance Indicators

### Availability of Parks

We report the percent of city residents living within a half-mile and within one mile of a city park.

**Why is it important?** This measure provides information about the location of parks relative to the city’s population. Recreational opportunities should be available, accessible, and convenient to citizens throughout the city. About 53 percent of respondents in 2003 rated their satisfaction with the location of parks as a 4 or 5, where 5 means very satisfied.

**How is the city doing?** Most Kansas City residents live close to a city park – 90 percent of residents live in blocks located within a half mile of city park land, and 99 percent of residents live in blocks within a mile of park land. About 90 percent of residents live within one mile of a developed park. A developed park contains an amenity such as a playground or trail.

#### Residents Living Near City Parks

	Residents within ½ mile	Residents within 1 mile
All parks	90.2%	98.8%
Developed parks	74.3%	89.9%

Source: Citywide Planning and Research Division, City Planning and Development Department.

While most people live near a city park, 60 percent of respondents said they visit a city park near their home less than once a month. The percentage of respondents

that said they seldom or never visit any city park declined significantly between 2002 and 2003 but remains above the 2001 percentage. Sixty-seven percent of respondents said they visit city recreation facilities such as community centers, swimming pools, sports fields, or golf courses less than once a month.

### Condition of Parks

We reported the percent of parks with problems as measured by trained observers in our November 2002 audit of park conditions.<sup>15</sup> Two auditors visited 50 parks between June 12 and July 26, 2002, and evaluated conditions using a standard checklist. Auditors rated the cleanliness of grounds, landscaping, condition of playgrounds, courts, ball fields, restrooms, and other amenities and structures using the following scale:

- “not applicable” if the amenity or structure was not present
- “no problem” if the amenity or structure was present and did not exhibit any of the problem conditions on the checklist
- “limited problem” when only a few of several of the same amenity had a problem, or a condition was noted in only a small portion of the park

<sup>15</sup> *Performance Audit, Park Conditions*, Office of the City Auditor, Kansas City, Missouri, November 2002.

- “widespread problem” when one of one amenity had a significant problem or if the condition was noted in a large portion of the park

In January 2003, the Parks and Recreation Department began its SHAPE (Safe, Healthy, and Attractive Public Environments) program whose mission is to measure the effectiveness of park maintenance through consistent monitoring and evaluation of public parks.

Parks staff randomly inspect a sample of developed parks. A quality control agent re-inspects parks on the same day as the SHAPE inspector. Ratings are compared by the department’s Chief of Operations. Inspectors assess 18 specific features in three categories:

- Cleanliness features:
  - litter
  - broken glass
  - graffiti
- Structural features:
  - sidewalks
  - park roads and parking lots
  - hard surfaces
  - seating areas
  - fences and barriers
  - play equipment
  - safety surfaces
  - drinking fountains
  - shelters and comfort stations

- Landscape features:
  - turf
  - trees
  - athletic fields
  - horticultural areas
  - water bodies
  - trails

A park receives an overall unacceptable rating if the cleanliness rating is unacceptable or three or more unacceptable feature ratings were given.

**Why is it important?** The condition of the city’s parks could affect citizen perception and use. Forty six percent of survey respondents rated their satisfaction with park maintenance as a 4 or 5, where 5 means very satisfied. Citizens’ overall satisfaction with maintenance of the city’s parks was below the median reported by all metropolitan area cities. Park maintenance topped the list of park-related items that respondents said city leaders should emphasize most over the next two years for the second year in a row.

**How is the city doing?** In the summer of 2002, litter and disrepair was prevalent in city parks. We observed limited or widespread problem conditions in all 50 parks we visited. We noted problems in cleanliness, playgrounds, courts and playing fields, restrooms, and other structures. Landscaping and mowing conditions were good. The table on the next page summarizes results of the 50 park inspections. The percent of parks with problems excludes parks for which the rating was not applicable.

Park Inspection Ratings, June and July 2002

Problem	Number of Parks Inspected			
	No Problem	Limited	Widespread	Percent with problem
<b>Cleanliness</b>				
Litter; trash piled or scattered	23	24	3	54%
Illegal dumping; large items of trash are discarded in the park	30	18	2	40%
Graffiti	38	8	4	24%
<b>Playgrounds</b>				
Play equipment has broken, corroded, loose, or missing parts	25	12	1	34%
Equipment is defaced or in need of painting or refinishing	20	9	9	47%
Sand, gravel or resilient play areas have weeds, debris	23	9	6	40%
Sand, gravel, or wood chips under play areas not level and soft or loose	21	13	4	45%
Broken glass hazard	29	6	3	24%
<b>Ball Diamonds, Basketball and Tennis Courts</b>				
Basketball/tennis court lines or surface in poor condition; tennis nets in poor condition	3	10	12	88%
Backstop/fences are not stable or have holes	11	17	2	63%
Field is not level, has ruts and/or infield has weeds	23	5	2	23%
Bleachers broken, rotted, need paint/repair	7	4	10	67%
Dugout bench broken, rotted, needs paint/repair	10	6	12	64%
Broken glass hazard	24	9	2	31%
<b>Restrooms</b>				
Sinks and toilets are dirty	9	0	4	31%
Walls are dirty or stained	11	2	1	21%
Trash, water or dirt on floors	10	2	2	29%
Lack of toilet paper or towels	11	1	2	21%
Fixtures – inoperable, leak, broken, missing	10	2	3	33%
Interior/exterior – faded or chipped paint, and/or marked with graffiti	10	3	1	29%
<b>Picnic Tables, Drinking Fountains, Grills, and Paths</b>				

Problem	Number of Parks Inspected			
	No Problem	Limited	Widespread	Percent with problem
Picnic tables broken or damaged	14	14	4	56%
Picnic tables dirty or greasy	29	1	2	9%
Picnic tables in need of repainting or refinishing	21	6	4	32%
Drinking fountains not operational, are visibly damaged or don't drain properly	8	4	9	62%
Grills are dirty and filled with ashes; grills are damaged	11	10	6	59%
Paths and walks overgrown, rutted, holes, muddy, blocked	16	9	4	45%
Structures damaged or broken	8	13	5	69%
Structures in need of repainting (due to graffiti, etc.)	14	3	6	39%
<b>Benches, Trash Cans, Park Signs, and Parking Areas</b>				
Benches broken or damaged	21	7	1	28%
Benches need repainting or refinishing	20	6	3	31%
Trash cans are overflowing	36	4	4	18%
Sign not visible or sign damaged	31	8	3	26%
Parking lot/driveway has pot holes	17	2	3	23%
<b>Landscaping</b>				
Grass is overgrown	47	2	1	6%
Grass brown, unhealthy or worn	40	9	1	20%
Grass not trimmed around fencing, walls and trees	43	7	0	14%
Dead trees, limbs, and/or shrubs	29	19	2	42%
Shrub beds and plantings have weeds	7	2	0	22%

Source: *Performance Audit: Park Conditions*, Office of the City Auditor, Kansas City, Missouri, November 2002.

During the first four months of 2003, Parks and Recreation department staff conducted over 200 park inspections with some parks being selected for inspection twice in a single month. All regions show a decline in unacceptable ratings from January results. Numbers of parks inspected and the percentage judged unacceptable are shown by region after the results from inspections by CAO staff in the summer of 2002.

Parks Judged Unacceptable by Parks and Recreation staff, January to April 2003

January 2003			February 2003		March 2003		April 2003	
Region	Parks Inspected	Unacceptable	Parks Inspected	Unacceptable	Parks Inspected	Unacceptable	Parks Inspected	Unacceptable
North	25	36%	15	27%	14	14%	18	17%
Central	31	35%	14	21%	21	14%	22	18%
South	22	18%	13	0%	13	8%	22	8%

Source: Parks and Recreation Department.

### Cost

We report net operating expense per capita and general fund support of the Parks and Recreation Department. Operating expenses include personnel costs such as wages and benefits, costs of services, and commodities, but exclude capital expenditures. Net operating expenses are operating expenses excluding non-tax revenue – fees and grants. We also exclude golf and zoo revenues and expenditures from net operating cost to be consistent with the ICMA definition.<sup>16</sup> Expenditures for fiscal year 2002 exclude those related to the ice storm in January 2002.

General fund support refers to money allocated to the Parks and Recreation Department beyond dedicated taxes, grants, and fee revenues. It includes money budgeted directly from the general fund and transfers from the general fund to parks funds.

<sup>16</sup> *Comparative Performance Measurement FY 2002 Data Report*, p. 5.

Tax revenues dedicated to the Parks and Recreation Department include:

- a property tax of \$0.50 per \$100 assessed value of land excluding improvements, for park maintenance;
- a license fee of \$12.50 per personal and commercial motor vehicle for parks and community centers;
- a levy of one dollar per foot of property abutting boulevards, parkways, roads, and highways under the control and management of the Board of Parks and Recreation Commissioners and used for boulevard maintenance, repair, and improvement.

**Why is it important?** Operating expense per capita is an efficiency measure that enables comparison of parks expenditures over time or among cities of varying populations. General fund support of parks may be compared to general fund support of other Kansas City programs and services or to general fund support of parks

in past fiscal years to monitor trends in reduction or growth. We recommended in March 2000 that the department report the operating cost per capita of its recreation programs, as well as general fund support.<sup>17</sup>

**How is the city doing?** The city's park system is well funded compared to other large cities. The city's net operating expense per capita and general fund support remain virtually unchanged between fiscal years 2002 and 2003 (excluding emergency expenditures related to the ice storm clean-up), and is slightly below the per capita of fiscal year 2001. In 2001, the city's net operating expense per capita was twice as high as the average of those reported to the ICMA by other large cities. The fiscal year 2001 average parks and recreation operating and maintenance expenditures per capita was \$22.68 for cities with populations greater than 100,000, compared to \$54.02 for Kansas City.<sup>18</sup>

Operating Expense Per Capita and General Fund  
Support for Parks and Recreation

	2001	2002	2003
Net Operating Expense per Capita	\$54.02	\$53.31	\$53.29
General Fund Support (millions)	\$20.8	\$19.9	\$19.9

Sources: Adopted Budget 2003, Adopted Budget 2004, and AFN.

<sup>17</sup> *Recreation Program Performance Measures*, Office of the City Auditor, Kansas City, Missouri, March 2000, pp. 8, 12.

<sup>18</sup> *Comparative Performance Measurement FY 2001 Data Report*, p. 351.





---

## Water and Sewer Services

The Water Services Department treats and distributes water. The department is also responsible for treating wastewater, maintaining the stormwater system, cleaning and repairing catch basins, and maintaining and repairing sewer and water lines. Services are funded by rates and fees charged to customers. The city has about 2,700 miles of water mains and 2,500 miles of sewer pipe.

### Water Services Expenditures (millions) and Authorized FTE

	2001	2002	2003
Expenditures	\$88.5	\$93.8	\$95.5
FTE	987.6	999.5	990.5

Sources: Adopted Budget 2002-2004, Submitted  
Budget 2005.

## Citizen Satisfaction with Water and Sewer Services

	Very Satisfied (5)			4			3			2			Very Dissatisfied (1)			Don't Know		
How satisfied are you with:	Nov 01	Oct 02	Nov 03	Nov 01	Oct 02	Nov 03	Nov 01	Oct 02	Nov 03	Nov 01	Oct 02	Nov 03	Nov 01	Oct 02	Nov 03	Nov 01	Oct 02	Nov 03
Overall quality of city water utilities?	27%	24%	25%	37%	38%	39%	20%	21%	21%	8%	9%	7%	5%	7%	6%	2%	2%	2%
Overall quality of the city's stormwater runoff/stormwater management system?	12%	11%	14%	25%	29%	28%	29%	29%	26%	15%	14%	13%	10%	12%	10%	9%	6%	10%

\*Bold indicates statistically significant changes at  $p < .05$

Sources: ETC Institute DirectionFinder Surveys.

## Water and Sewer Services Performance Indicators

### Drinking water quality

We report instances where Kansas City water failed to meet state or federal standards in fiscal years 2000 through 2003, and customer satisfaction with water.

The Water Department Customer Satisfaction Survey released in March 2003 asked customers about their satisfaction with the color, smell, water pressure, clarity, taste, and relative quality of tap water supplied by the city. Customers surveyed by phone were asked to rate their satisfaction on a scale where 5 meant 'very satisfied' and 1 meant 'very dissatisfied.' The Water Department intends to conduct their Customer Satisfaction Survey every two to three years.

**Why is it important?** Water quality standards ensure that water is safe for consumption. Water that does not meet quality standards may pose health risks, additional costs, or inconveniences. Other aspects of water quality such as taste, color, smell, and level of pressure influence customer satisfaction.

**How is the city doing?** Kansas City water met all state and federal water quality standards throughout fiscal years 2000 through 2003.

Most water customers surveyed were satisfied with the quality of their water. Respondents identified taste of the water as the most important factor in water quality. Percent of those surveyed who were satisfied with the

taste of their water has dropped from 73 percent in 1999 to 67 percent in 2003.

### Customer Satisfaction with Water Quality 1999 and 2003

Factors (In order of Importance)	Very Satisfied/ Somewhat Satisfied (5)/(4)		Somewhat Dissatisfied/ Very Dissatisfied (2)/(1)	
	1999	2003	1999	2003
Taste	73%	67%	17%	17%
Clarity	81%	76%	11%	12%
Water Pressure: Typical Day	82%	83%	11%	9%
Smell	83%	84%	10%	8%
Quality: KC vs. Other City	51%	61%	5%	6%
Color	87%	83%	7%	8%
Water Pressure: High Demand	73%	73%	16%	13%

Source: Customer Satisfaction Survey, Kansas City Missouri Water Services Department, ETC Institute, October 1999 and March 2003.

### Water and Sewer Costs

We calculated the average bi-monthly (every two months) water and sewer bills per household in fiscal years 2001, 2002 and 2003 based on average water use and water and sewer rates in that year. Kansas City measures water in units of one hundred cubic feet (ccf).

**Why is it important?** Customers care about the cost of water and sewer service. In the 2003 Customer Satisfaction Survey, 64 percent of respondents reported that they were at least somewhat satisfied with water charges and 23 percent expressed dissatisfaction. When asked how their rates compared to rates in other cities, 42 percent were satisfied and 13 percent reported dissatisfaction.<sup>19</sup> Compared to other cities in the metropolitan area, citizen satisfaction with the overall quality of city water utilities is above average. In 2003, 64 percent rated their satisfaction as a 5 or 4, where 5 means very satisfied.

**How is the city doing?** The average sewer bill increased 9.6 percent between fiscal years 2002 and 2003, with sewer rates increasing in each of the last three years. The average water bill has fluctuated with changes in usage; water rates have not changed in the last three years. Kansas City residents generally pay less for water than do customers of other water utilities in the metropolitan area.

**Average Bi-Monthly Water and Sewer Bills**

	2001	2002	2003
Water	\$37.59	\$35.61	\$37.19
Sewer	23.94	24.84	27.23

Sources: Schedule of Water and Sanitary Sewer Service Rates, 2001-2003.

Kansas City water rates are lower than those in Johnson County Water District 1 and Lee's Summit, but higher than in Independence. These four utilities

<sup>19</sup> *Customer Satisfaction Survey, Kansas City, Missouri Water Services Department*, ETC Institute, March 2003.

supply water to the majority of residents in the Kansas City metropolitan area.

**Dependability**

We report the number of water main breaks per hundred miles of pipeline and the total number of sewer overflows reported to the Missouri Department of Natural Resources. Sewer overflows include both sanitary sewer overflows and combined sewer overflows. Sanitary sewer overflows are discharges of untreated sewage from municipal sanitary sewer systems resulting from broken pipes, equipment failure, or system overload. Combined sewer overflows are discharges of untreated sewage and storm water from sewer systems or treatment plants when the volume of wastewater exceeds the system's capacity due to periods of heavy rainfall or snow melt.

**Why is it important?** The number of water main breaks per hundred miles provides information about the structural integrity and dependability of the city's water transport system. Frequent water main breaks result in loss of water, reduced water pressure, damage to streets and property, higher repair costs, and could contaminate drinking water. The amount of water treated, but not billed was about 25 percent of water production in 2001.<sup>20</sup>

The number of sewer overflows is a measure of the capacity and dependability of the sewer or combined sewer/storm water system to handle the total volume of wastewater. Overflows sometimes occur even in well-operated systems due to pipe blockages.

<sup>20</sup> *KCGO Executive Summary of Competitive Business Plan*, December 12, 2001, p. 14.

However frequent overflows may indicate pipe breaks or leaks, equipment failures, and insufficient system capacity. Overflows are required to be reported to the Missouri Department of Natural Resources.

**How is the city doing?** The total number of water main breaks increased last year, but the number of reported sewer overflows has decreased. City crews repaired 1,138 main breaks in fiscal year 2003 resulting in about 10 more main breaks per hundred miles of pipeline than in 2002. KC-GO's Competitive Review Committee has proposed a benchmark of 7 main breaks per 100 miles of pipeline based on an average of six benchmark utilities.<sup>21</sup>

**Water Main Breaks per 100 Miles<sup>22</sup>**

	2001	2002	2003	KCGO Benchmark
Main breaks per 100 miles	39.8	32.0	42.1	7.0

Source: Water Services Work Order System.

The Water Department reported 124 total sanitary sewer overflows to the Missouri Department of Natural Resources in fiscal year 2003. Of these bypasses, 104 were reported as dry weather and 20 were reported as wet weather.

**Reported Sewer Overflows**

	2001	2002	2003
Dry Weather	72	94	104
Wet Weather	40	52	20
<b>Total</b>	<b>112</b>	<b>146</b>	<b>124</b>

Source: Missouri Department of Natural Resources, Kansas City Regional Office.

<sup>21</sup> Kansas City Government Organization (KCGO) is a labor/management initiative focused on improving the way the city provides services to the public. *City of Kansas City, Missouri, Competitive Review Committee, Water Service Competitive Business Plan*, December 13, 2001.

<sup>22</sup> 2001 and 2002 numbers are based on 2,600 miles of mains. 2003 number is based on 2,700 miles of mains.



## Neighborhood Livability

Neighborhoods are the building blocks of our community and city. We recognize that “neighborhood livability” is related to the other service areas we are covering: streets, water and sewer, parks and recreation, and public safety, as well as the category of “overall quality of life.” This category focuses on aspects of neighborhood livability not already included in other categories and reports indicators at the neighborhood level.

Many city departments work with and serve neighborhoods. The Neighborhood and Community Services Department enforces property maintenance and nuisance codes, tows abandoned vehicles, demolishes dangerous buildings, enforces the city’s animal ordinance, and provides other social and neighborhood services. The Housing and Community Development Department assists individuals, private developers, and not-for-profit organizations in producing new housing, rehabilitating existing housing, and redeveloping neighborhoods. The Environmental Management Department provides residential trash collection, leaf and brush pick-up, bulky item pick-up, and the Clean City program to clean up vacant lots and assist with neighborhood clean up efforts, and investigates and resolves illegal dumping and weed abatement problems.

### Neighborhood and Community Services Department Expenditures (millions) and Authorized FTE

	2001	2002	2003
Expenditures	\$24.1	\$24.0	\$22.7
FTE	260.3	260.0	253.0

Sources: Adopted Budget 2003 and 2004, and Submitted Budget 2005.

### Housing and Community Development Department Expenditures (millions) and Authorized FTE

	2001	2002	2003
Expenditures	\$18.0	\$17.1	\$15.0
FTE	42.0	42.0	42.0

Sources: Adopted Budget 2003 and 2004, and Submitted Budget 2005.



### Environmental Management Department Expenditures (millions) and Authorized FTE

	2001	2002	2003
Expenditures	\$15.9	20.8	\$15.3
FTE	125.2	114.0	97.0

Sources: Adopted Budget 2003 and 2004, and Submitted Budget 2005.



## Citizen Survey Benchmarking Data



# Citizen Satisfaction with Neighborhood Livability

	Very Satisfied (5)			4			3			2			Very Dissatisfied (1)			Don't Know		
How satisfied are you with:	Nov 01	Oct 02	Nov 03	Nov 01	Oct 02	Nov 03	Nov 01	Oct 02	Nov 03	Nov 01	Oct 02	Nov 03	Nov 01	Oct 02	Nov 03	Nov 01	Oct 02	Nov 03
Maintenance of streets in your neighborhood?	10%	10%	7%	23%	25%	22%	23%	<b>21%</b>	<b>26%</b>	22%	21%	23%	21%	21%	22%	1%	1%	<1%
Enforcing the clean up of litter and debris on private property?	8%	9%	7%	25%	22%	23%	28%	30%	28%	17%	19%	17%	11%	13%	13%	<b>11%</b>	<b>7%</b>	<b>13%</b>
Enforcing the mowing and cutting of weeds on private property?	8%	8%	9%	23%	23%	22%	29%	<b>32%</b>	<b>26%</b>	19%	19%	18%	11%	11%	12%	10%	<b>7%</b>	<b>13%</b>
Enforcing the maintenance of residential property?	7%	9%	8%	26%	26%	24%	32%	33%	31%	14%	15%	16%	10%	9%	10%	10%	<b>7%</b>	<b>12%</b>
Enforcing the exterior maintenance of business property?	10%	10%	9%	28%	29%	29%	34%	32%	32%	11%	<b>14%</b>	<b>9%</b>	5%	7%	5%	<b>13%</b>	<b>8%</b>	<b>16%</b>
Enforcing codes designed to protect public safety and public health?	10%	11%	11%	31%	30%	30%	32%	30%	31%	<b>9%</b>	<b>13%</b>	<b>8%</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>8%</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>14%</b>	<b>8%</b>	<b>15%</b>
Enforcing and prosecuting illegal dumping activities?	7%	9%	9%	18%	<b>22%</b>	<b>16%</b>	29%	28%	26%	16%	17%	18%	13%	15%	14%	<b>17%</b>	<b>9%</b>	<b>18%</b>
Enforcing equal opportunity among all citizens?**	n/a	n/a	11%	n/a	n/a	27%	n/a	n/a	27%	n/a	n/a	11%	n/a	n/a	9%	n/a	n/a	14%
Overall quality of trash collection services?	21%	18%	22%	<b>42%</b>	<b>36%</b>	41%	20%	24%	21%	<b>9%</b>	<b>13%</b>	<b>9%</b>	6%	7%	4%	2%	3%	3%
Timeliness of the removal of abandoned cars from public property?	9%	9%	9%	<b>19%</b>	<b>25%</b>	23%	26%	30%	25%	16%	15%	14%	12%	10%	11%	<b>17%</b>	<b>11%</b>	<b>17%</b>
Overall quality of the city's stormwater runoff/stormwater management system?	12%	11%	14%	25%	29%	28%	29%	29%	26%	15%	14%	13%	10%	12%	10%	9%	6%	10%

\*Bold indicates statistically significant changes at p< .05

Sources: ETC Institute DirectionFinder Surveys.

\*\* New question

## Code Enforcement Priorities

Which two of these code enforcement items do you think should receive the most emphasis from city leaders over the next two years?

	2002			2003		
	First choice	Second Choice	In Top Two	First choice	Second Choice	In Top Two
Illegal dumping	19%	17%	36%	18%	15%	33%
Clean up litter	28%	14%	42%	22%	10%	31%
Equal opportunity among all citizens **	n/a	n/a	n/a	11%	12%	23%
Mow/cut weeds	10%	15%	25%	7%	13%	20%
Residential maintenance	9%	12%	20%	8%	12%	20%
Codes to protect safety and public health	8%	10%	18%	6%	6%	12%
Business exterior maintenance	6%	7%	14%	5%	3%	9%
Sign regulation	5%	8%	12%	3%	4%	7%
None selected	16%	18%	16%	21%	26%	21%

\*\*Asked for the first time in 2003

Sources: ETC Institute 2002 and 2003 DirectionFinder Surveys.

# Performance Indicators

## Home Ownership

We report the percent of owner-occupied housing in neighborhoods. We did not update this information this year.

**Why is it important?** Home equity is a major component of wealth for most households that own their homes. Home ownership also increases residents' sense of community ownership.

**How is the city doing?** The rate of home ownership has increased slightly in the city since 1990. Home ownership rates continue to vary across neighborhoods.

Percent of Owner-occupied Housing Units in Neighborhoods

Percent Owner-occupied	Number of Neighborhoods	
	1990	2000
25% or less	44	38
25.1–50%	52	64
50.1–75%	75	69
75.1–100%	68	69
Total	239	240

Sources: City Planning and Development Department, 1990 and 2000 census data by neighborhood.

Citywide, 52 percent of housing units were owner occupied in 2000, compared to 50 percent in 1990. Nationally, the homeownership rate was about 51 percent in central cities in 2000 and 49 percent in 1990.

Homeownership varies across neighborhoods. Over half of the total housing units were owner occupied in 58 percent of the city's neighborhoods in 2000, and 60 percent of neighborhoods in 1990.

## Housing and Property Maintenance

We report the percent of neighborhood housing needing major repairs, and the percent of property code violation problems resolved. We did not update the information of the percent of neighborhood housing needing major repairs this year.

The Department of Housing and Community Development contracted with the Center for Economic Information at the University of Missouri-Kansas City (UMKC) to conduct the 2001 Housing Conditions Survey. The survey rated residential housing conditions by parcel, including the roof, foundation and walls, windows and doors, exterior paint, private sidewalks and drives, lawns and shrubs, and litter. We define structure problems as properties with roofs or foundations rated as "substandard," "seriously deteriorated," or "severely deteriorated."

The housing condition survey covered 100 percent of the residential structures in about 40 percent of the city, and 5 percent samples in the remaining areas of the city. The "100 percent survey area" contains about 80,450 parcels in 120 neighborhoods in an area

generally from Vivion Road on the north to 85<sup>th</sup> Street on the south, from State Line and Troost on the west, to I-435 on the east. The “5 percent survey area” covers the newer portions of the city and includes 4,491 parcels.

The Neighborhood Preservation Division in the Neighborhood and Community Services Department enforces property codes. Property code violation cases are closed when the problems are abated. The total number of open cases includes new cases opened in the current fiscal year and cases that were not closed from the previous years.

**Why is it important?** Well-maintained properties increase neighborhoods’ housing values as well as residents’ sense of pride and ownership of the community. On the other hand, poorly maintained properties are related to community deterioration. Property code enforcement helps a neighborhood sustain its safety as well as quality of life. Citizen satisfaction with enforcement of residential property codes has been generally low, but improved in 2001 and stayed about the same in 2002 and 2003. While citizen satisfaction with aspects of code enforcement is still below the average of other cities in the metropolitan area, citizens’ overall satisfaction with code enforcement is consistent with that of other large cities in the central United States. Clean up litter and illegal dumping topped the list of code-related items that respondents said city leaders should emphasize most over the next two years.

**How is the city doing?** About 40 percent of homes rated in UMKC’s housing condition survey need

structural repairs. The percent of homes in each neighborhood needing structural repairs varies widely. The number of abated property code cases has increased over the past three years, but is lower than the average for cities reporting to the ICMA.

Over 40 percent of the neighborhoods included in the “100 percent survey area” of the Housing Conditions Survey had more than half of their housing in need of structural repair. About 7 percent of the neighborhoods did not have any housing with structure problems.

Percent of Surveyed Neighborhoods with Housing Structure Problems

Percent of Housing with Structure Problems	Number of Surveyed Neighborhoods
75-100%	8
50-74.9%	40
25-49.9%	29
1-24.9%	29
0%	8
<b>Total</b>	<b>114</b>

Source: The UMKC Center for Economic Information, City of Kansas City, Missouri 2000/2001 Neighborhood Housing Conditions Survey, March 29, 2002.

The structural average score groups together the scores for roof, foundation/wall, window/door/ porch, and exterior paint. The best possible score is 5.0, and the worst possible score is 1.00. More homes in the newer portions of the city are rated high in housing structures, where almost half of the homes have an average structural score between 4.5 and 5, compared to almost one third of the homes in the “100 percent survey area.”

## Percent of Homes with Structure Problems

Structural	100%		
Average Score	Survey Area	5% Survey Area	City-Wide
1.0 - 2.49	2.0%	0.1%	0.9%
2.5-4.49	64.2%	50.8%	56.1%
4.5-5.0	33.8%	49.1%	43.0%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Source: The UMKC Center for Economic Information, City of Kansas City, Missouri 2000/2001 Neighborhood Housing Conditions Survey, March 29, 2002.

Resolution of property code cases has continuously improved over the past years. About 70 percent of cases were closed in fiscal year 2003, improved from around 67 percent in fiscal years 2001 and 2002. However, the rate is still lower than the average of other large cities reporting to the ICMA. For fiscal year 2002, the average case closure rate was 78.7 percent for all reporting cities with populations of 100,000 or more.<sup>23</sup>

Percent of Property Code Violation Cases Closed  
Fiscal Years 2000-2003

	2000	2001	2002	2003
Cases	24,817	22,030	24,811	23,052
Closed	16,288	14,734	16,707	16,123
Percent	65.6%	66.9%	67.3%	69.9%

Sources: Neighborhood Preservation Division, Neighborhood and Community Services Department, Statistical Report, January 6, 2004.

<sup>23</sup> ICMA Center for Performance Measurement, *FY2002 Code Enforcement*, p8.

## Physical Infrastructure

We report the percent of surveyed neighborhoods rated in the 2001 Housing Conditions Survey with no sidewalks or with deteriorated sidewalks, with streetlight problems, and with deteriorated catch basins. We did not update this information this year. We also report the percent of catch basins cleaned each year and the results related to water drainage in the customer satisfaction survey conducted by the Water Services Department.

The 2001 Housing Conditions Survey evaluated the public infrastructure next to the parcel in addition to assessing the private properties. The survey rated conditions of sidewalks, curbs, streets, streetlights, and catch basins.

We define deteriorated sidewalks as those that were rated “sub-standard,” “seriously deteriorated,” or “severely deteriorated.” We define streetlight problems as parcels where streetlights were rated as a “significant problem,” “serious problem,” or “severe problem.” Catch basin problems refer to catch basins that were rated “sub-standard,” “seriously deteriorated,” or “severely deteriorated.”

The Water Services Department tracks catch basin cleaning and repairs. Catch basins are inlets connecting to the stormwater system. The department conducted customer satisfaction surveys in 1999 and 2003.

**Why is it important?** Neighborhood infrastructure helps to form the backbone of a neighborhood and serves the people living within. Sidewalks improve pedestrian safety and encourage informal encounters among neighbors.

Citizens report a relatively low level of satisfaction with condition of city sidewalks. Over 40 percent of respondents in 2003 rated their satisfaction as a 1 or 2, where 1 means very dissatisfied in 2003. Compared to other communities in the metropolitan area, citizen satisfaction with maintenance of city sidewalks in Kansas City was below average.

Streetlights improve street visibility and may also complement neighborhood crime prevention efforts. Street lighting has had one of the highest citizen satisfaction ratings. Citizen satisfaction with the adequacy of street lighting increased in 2003 – 64 percent of respondents in 2003 rated their satisfaction as a 5 or 4, where 5 means very satisfied; 57 percent of respondents in 2002 rated their satisfaction with street lights as 5 or 4 in 2002. Citizen satisfaction with the adequacy of street lighting is near the average of other communities in the metropolitan area.

Cleaning catch basins helps to reduce the risk of flooding. The city's goal is to clean all of the city's 34,000 catch basins at least once every two years. The city also cleans catch basins in response to citizen requests. Compared to other communities in the metropolitan area, citizen satisfaction with the overall quality of storm water management was above average. Citizens' satisfaction with the overall quality

of storm water management has improved since 2000. In 2000, 33 percent of respondents rated their satisfaction with the quality of storm water management as a 1 or 2, where 1 means very dissatisfied. This percentage decreased to 26 percent in 2002 and 23 percent in 2003.

**How is the city doing?** The majority of neighborhoods rated in the housing condition survey had no sidewalks or had deteriorated sidewalks. However, most of the neighborhoods had no problems with streetlights and most catch basins were rated as adequate. The number of catch basins cleaned citywide has been over 17,000 each year since 2000. (The city's goal is to clean all 34,000 catch basins at least once every two years.)

Over 40 percent of the parcels in the "100 percent survey area" do not have or have deteriorated sidewalks. Over one fourth of the neighborhoods evaluated (27%) in the "100 percent survey area" have problems with most of their sidewalks (75% or more). Only 6 neighborhoods among the 120 evaluated had no problems with sidewalks.

Percent of Surveyed Neighborhoods with No Sidewalks or Deteriorated Sidewalks

Percent of Parcels with No or Deteriorated Sidewalks	Number of Surveyed Neighborhoods
75-100%	32
50-74.9%	18
25-49.9%	23
1-24.9%	41
0%	6
<b>Total</b>	<b>120</b>

Source: The UMKC Center for Economic Information, City of Kansas City, Missouri 2000/2001 Neighborhood Housing Conditions Survey, March 29, 2002.

Most of the neighborhoods evaluated in the “100 percent survey area” had no problems with their streetlights. In neighborhoods with problems noted, most of the streetlights worked properly.

Percent of Surveyed Neighborhoods with Streetlight Problems

Percent of Parcels with Streetlight Problems	Number of Surveyed Neighborhoods
75-100%	0
50-74.9%	0
25-49.9%	0
1-24.9%	47
0%	73
<b>Total</b>	<b>120</b>

Source: The UMKC Center for Economic Information, City of Kansas City, Missouri 2000/2001 Neighborhood Housing Conditions Survey, March 29, 2002.

Catch basins in most of the neighborhoods rated as functioning adequately or in perfect operational condition.

Percent of Surveyed Neighborhoods with Catch Basin Problems

Percent of Catch Basins with Problems	Number of Surveyed Neighborhoods
75-100%	1
50-74.9%	5
25-49.9%	28
1-24.9%	51
0%	33
<b>Total</b>	<b>118</b>

Source: The UMKC Center for Economic Information, City of Kansas City, Missouri 2000/2001 Neighborhood Housing Conditions Survey, March 29, 2002.

The number of catch basins cleaned citywide has been over half of the city’s goal each year, although it declined from 73 percent in 2001 to 65 percent in 2002 and 53 percent in 2003. Water Services staff reported that the department focuses on cleaning catch basins where it is needed the most and where the majority of citizen complaints were received these years. The department used to concentrate on cleaning as many catch basins as possible in the past while many of them were in new subdivisions that did not require frequent cleaning or inspection.

The Water Services Department stopped reporting the number of catch basins that were cleaned at the request of citizens, as the number was derived from work crew’s daily time reports and were not accurate.



Percent of Catch Basins Cleaned

	2000	2001	2002	2003
Number	18,996	24,891	22,147	17,906
Percent of City's Goal	56%	73%	65%	53%

Source: Water Services Department.

The Water Services Department conducted customer satisfaction surveys in 1999 and 2003. Citizen satisfaction with drainage of rain water off city streets, neighborhood streets, and residential properties in 2003 improved from that in 1999.

Satisfaction with Drainage of Rain Water off Streets Following a Heavy Rain (Percentage of respondents who rated 4 or 5 where 5 means "very satisfied")

	1999	2003
Near your residence	66%	72%
Other streets in Kansas City, MO	41%	52%
The properties next to your residence	64%	69%

Source: ETC Institute, 2003 Residential Customer Satisfaction Survey Summary Report, March, 2003.

The percent of residents who experienced storm or flood water at their residence during the past years reduced in 2003.

Percent of Residents Who Experienced Storm or Flood Water at Residence During the Past Three Years

	1999	2003
Storm/flood water in residence	30%	17%
Sanitary sewer backed into resident	16%	14%

Source: ETC Institute, 2003 Residential Customer Satisfaction Survey Summary Report, March, 2003.

## Social Characteristics

We report racial composition in the city and the metropolitan area using the dissimilarity index, which measures the extent to which blacks/African-Americans are unevenly distributed relative to a baseline of perfect integration. An index measure of 0 would represent perfect integration – where the proportion of black/African-American residents in each census tract of the city would approximately equal the proportion citywide. Conversely, an index measure of 1 would represent absolute segregation. An index measure of 0.6 is said to represent "hypersegregation."<sup>24</sup> We also report the distribution of children by neighborhood. We did not update this information this year.

**Why is it important?** One way to assess the health of neighborhoods is by comparing demographic characteristics of neighborhoods to those of the overall city. Concentrations of racial segregation or loss of families with children could indicate problems.

Research has shown that racial segregation is related to concentrations of poverty, which is in turn related to social problems such as crime and drug abuse.<sup>25</sup> Residential segregation creates barriers for families to education, employment, a safe environment, fair

<sup>24</sup> Edward Glaeser and Jacob Vigdor, "Racial Segregation in the 2000 Census: Promising News," The Brookings Institution, Survey Series, April 2001.

<sup>25</sup> Massey, Douglas S., "American Apartheid: Housing Segregation and Persistent Urban Poverty," NIU Social Science Research Institute Distinguished Lectures, March 1994.

insurance rates, and wealth in the form of home equity. Residential segregation also undermines the community as a whole.

**How is the city doing?** Kansas City remains a racially segregated city, although there has been some improvement since 1990. The percent of children in Kansas City is similar to the metropolitan area as a whole.

The dissimilarity indices declined in Kansas City and the metropolitan area between 1990 and 2000. However, the indices remain above 0.6, representing a high level of segregation. The indices of Kansas City are a little bit lower than the metropolitan area. About three-quarters of Kansas City's neighborhoods can be considered highly segregated – where the black/African-American population is more than 60 percent different from the citywide proportion.

#### Black/Non-black Dissimilarity (1990 and 2000)

	1990	2000
Kansas City, MO	0.712	0.662
Kansas City, MO-KS MSA	0.721	0.683

Sources: 1990 & 2000 Census data from the City Planning and Development Department; Edward Glaeser and Jacob Vigdor, "Racial Segregation in the 2000 Census: Promising News," The Brookings Institution, Survey Series, April 2001.

#### Highly Segregated Neighborhoods (1990 and 2000)

Percentage of Black Population in Neighborhood	Number of Neighborhoods		Change
	1990	2000	
Much less than citywide proportion <sup>26</sup>	131	117	-11%
Much more than citywide proportion <sup>27</sup>	51	62	22%
Total of highly segregated neighborhoods	182	179	-2%
Percent of city neighborhoods	76%	75%	-1%

Sources: 1990 and 2000 Census data from the City Planning and Development Department.

Children under the age of 15 make up about 21 percent of Kansas City's population, which is similar to the metropolitan area as a whole. However, children are not evenly distributed by neighborhoods – about 70 percent of the children live in half of the city's neighborhoods.

<sup>26</sup> The proportion of black/African-American population in a neighborhood is at least 60 percent less than it is citywide (less than 11.8 percent of the neighborhood population).

<sup>27</sup> The proportion of black/African-American population in a neighborhood is at least 60 percent more than it is citywide (more than 47.4 percent of the neighborhood population).

Child Population in KCMO Compared to That in the Metropolitan Area

	KCMO	Kansas City, MO-KS MSA
Total under age 15	94,354	394,131
Total population	441,545	776,062
Percent under 15	21%	22%

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, Census 2000.

Child Distribution by Neighborhood (2000)

Percent of Population Under 15	Number (Percent) of Neighborhoods	Number (Percent) of Children
0-10%	24 (10%)	2,194 (2%)
11-20%	89 (37%)	23,795 (25%)
21-30%	115 (48%)	62,825 (67%)
31-40%	7 (3%)	3,446 (4%)
41-50%	5 (2%)	2,053 (2%)
Total	240 (100%)	94,313 (100%)



Source: 2000 Census data from the City Planning and Development Department.

---

## Overall Quality of Life

Community “quality of life” is a broad concept that has generated numerous definitions and measurements ranging from standard statistics, such as the Cost of Living Index, to subjective indicators, such as “feelings of happiness.” Here, we report measures of wealth, employment, education, and health in Kansas City. While external economic conditions that influence these aspects of quality of life are largely beyond the control of local government, measuring these conditions can help the city respond to changes. In the long run, building an economic base – through maintaining capital infrastructure, competitive tax rates, and providing an adequate level of service – will encourage businesses and families to stay in the city.

## Citizen Survey Benchmarking Data



## Citizen Satisfaction with Overall Quality of Life

	Very Satisfied (5)			4			3			2			Very Dissatisfied (1)			Don't Know		
	Nov 01	Oct 02	Nov 03	Nov 01	Oct 02	Nov 03	Nov 01	Oct 02	Nov 03	Nov 01	Oct 02	Nov 03	Nov 01	Oct 02	Nov 03	Nov 01	Oct 02	Nov 03
<b>How satisfied are you with:</b>																		
Overall quality of services provided by the City of Kansas City, Missouri?	12%	13%	14%	42%	39%	39%	33%	34%	33%	7%	9%	10%	3%	4%	3%	1%	1%	2%
Overall value that you receive for your city tax dollars and fees?	8%	9%	8%	28%	26%	27%	34%	34%	33%	18%	19%	16%	9%	11%	12%	2%	2%	4%
Overall image of the city?	18%	14%	15%	36%	34%	38%	27%	30%	27%	14%	15%	13%	5%	6%	6%	1%	2%	1%
How well the city is planning growth?	12%	11%	11%	27%	26%	26%	31%	30%	28%	15%	18%	18%	9%	9%	8%	7%	7%	9%
Overall quality of life in the city?	17%	14%	16%	44%	39%	42%	26%	30%	29%	8%	11%	9%	3%	5%	3%	2%	2%	2%
Overall feeling of safety in the city?	10%	10%	10%	<b>36%</b>	<b>30%</b>	33%	31%	34%	32%	15%	17%	16%	7%	8%	8%	1%	1%	1%

	Excellent (5)			4			3			2			Poor (1)			Don't Know		
	Nov 01	Oct 02	Nov 03	Nov 01	Oct 02	Nov 03	Nov 01	Oct 02	Nov 03	Nov 01	Oct 02	Nov 03	Nov 01	Oct 02	Nov 03	Nov 01	Oct 02	Nov 03
<b>How would you rate Kansas City, Missouri:</b>																		
As a place to live?	27%	28%	23%	46%	42%	43%	20%	20%	24%	4%	6%	6%	2%	3%	3%	<1%	1%	1%
As a place to raise children?	20%	20%	17%	38%	35%	35%	22%	23%	26%	11%	13%	11%	5%	7%	7%	3%	3%	5%
As a place to work?	23%	<b>24%</b>	<b>18%</b>	<b>45%</b>	42%	<b>39%</b>	21%	21%	26%	6%	7%	8%	3%	3%	5%	2%	2%	4%

	Very Satisfied (5)			4			3			2			Very Dissatisfied (1)			Don't Know		
	Nov 01	Oct 02	Nov 03	Nov 01	Oct 02	Nov 03	Nov 01	Oct 02	Nov 03	Nov 01	Oct 02	Nov 03	Nov 01	Oct 02	Nov 03	Nov 01	Oct 02	Nov 03
<b>How satisfied are you with:</b>																		
Overall quality of leadership provided by the city's elected officials?	7%	9%	7%	30%	30%	28%	33%	34%	35%	17%	13%	13%	8%	8%	8%	5%	7%	9%
Overall effectiveness of appointed boards and commissions?	6%	9%	7%	24%	26%	23%	35%	33%	33%	16%	15%	15%	9%	7%	7%	10%	11%	15%
Overall effectiveness of the City Manager and appointed staff?	6%	9%	7%	28%	29%	26%	35%	34%	33%	14%	13%	12%	7%	6%	6%	11%	10%	16%

\*Bold indicates statistically significant changes at  $p < .05$

Sources: ETC Institute DirectionFinder Surveys.

## Performance Indicators

### Wealth

We report income distribution, median household income, the value of owner occupied housing, age of the city's housing stock, the number of homeless individuals and families, the number of homeless children in the Kansas City, Missouri, School District, and the percentage of students qualified for free or discounted lunch. We did not update the age of the city's housing stock, and the number of homeless individuals and families this year.

Income includes wage or salary, self-employment income, interest or dividend, social security, supplemental security, retirement or disability income, public assistance, and other regularly received money income. The 1990 Census provides income data for calendar year 1989 and the 2000 Census provides income data for calendar year 1999. The 2002 American Community Survey estimates the annual income average based on monthly samples in 2002.

The Homeless Services Coalition of Greater Kansas City conducted point in time counts of homeless persons at places of emergency shelter, transitional housing, permanent supportive housing, and street outreach in April and November 2000, November 2001, and November 2002. The count was a snap shot of the number of homeless individuals and families on a specific day of the year. The counts in 2000 and 2001 included the number of persons on the waiting

lists for the transitional housing. The waiting lists were not included in 2002, as the transitional housing agencies are no longer maintaining the waiting lists.

The Homeless Services Coalition of Greater Kansas City plans to conduct the count of homeless persons every three years instead of updating it every year. The coalition works with the Kansas City, Missouri, School District to provide homeless services to children and youths. Homeless children and youths are those who lack a fixed, regular, and adequate nighttime residence. The Kansas City, Missouri, School District tracks the monthly number of children and youths in the school district who newly sign up for homeless services.

The Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education reports the number of students who are qualified for free or reduced free lunch in each school district every year. Students whose family income is at 130 percent of the federal income poverty guidelines are eligible for free lunch; and those whose family income is at 185 percent of the poverty guidelines are eligible for reduced priced lunch.

**Why is it important?** Income is a key determinant of individual, family and community well-being. Income levels indicate the ability of individuals and families to meet their needs and correlate with their conditions of health, education, social interaction, housing, leisure, and general life style.

Housing is a major component of household wealth. Home equity is a cornerstone of wealth for most households that own their homes. While homeownership indicates wealth, homelessness indicates lack of wealth.

**How is the city doing?** The median household income and median value of owner occupied housing in Kansas City increased in real terms between 1990 and 2002. However, the percent of households in the lowest income category is much higher in Kansas City than in the metropolitan area as a whole. Homelessness remains a problem and the number of students qualified for free or discounted lunch has been increasing.

Kansas City's median income increased about 40 percent, compared to about 30 percent inflation, between 1990 and 2000. Its median income continued to increase over 5 percent between 2000 and 2002 while the inflation was about 4 percent. However, income is lower in Kansas City than in the metropolitan area as a whole. A much higher percentage of Kansas City households reported an annual income of less than \$10,000 than in the five county metropolitan area.

Overall Quality of Life  
Household Income (1990, 2000 and 2002)<sup>28</sup>

	1990		2000		2002	
	Households		Households		Households	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Less than \$10,000	31,800	18.0%	21,385	11.6%	19,487	10.4%
\$10,000 to \$14,999	16,784	9.5%	11,745	6.4%	12,086	6.5%
\$15,000 to \$24,999	33,988	19.2%	26,325	14.3%	25,423	13.6%
\$25,000 to \$34,999	29,828	16.8%	27,110	14.7%	25,629	13.7%
\$35,000 to \$49,999	30,575	17.3%	31,731	17.2%	31,891	17.1%
\$50,000 to \$74,999	22,866	12.9%	34,354	18.7%	32,396	17.3%
\$75,000 to \$99,999	6,246	3.5%	16,037	8.7%	19,225	10.3%
\$100,000 to \$149,999	3,328	1.9%	10,330	5.6%	16,056	8.6%
\$150,000 to \$199,999	1,742*	1.0%	2,213	1.2%	2,607	1.4%
\$200,000 or more			2,798	1.5%	2,188	1.2%
Total households	177,157	100.0%	184,028	100.0%	186,988	100.0%
Median household income	\$26,713		\$37,198		\$39,230	

\*\$150,000 or more.

Sources: U.S. Bureau of Census, *Census 1990 Population and Housing*, *Census 2000*, and *2002 American Community Survey*

<sup>28</sup> The 1990 and 2000 figures are not adjusted for inflation.



Household Income in KCMO Compared to that in the Metropolitan Area (2002)

Household income	Percent of Households	
	Kansas City, MO	Kansas City, MO--KS MSA
Less than \$10,000	10.4%	7.6%
\$10,000-14,999	6.5%	5.2%
\$15,000-24,999	13.6%	11.3%
\$25,000-34,999	13.7%	12.4%
\$35,000-49,999	17.1%	16.4%
\$50,000-74,999	17.3%	20.2%
\$75,000-99,999	10.3%	12.9%
\$100,000-149,999	8.6%	10.0%
\$150,000-199,999	1.4%	2.3%
\$200,000 or more	1.2%	1.7%
Total households	186,988	715,926
Median household income	\$39,230	\$ 46,992

Source: U.S. Bureau of Census, *2002 American Community Survey*.

The median value of owner occupied housing also increased in real terms between 1990 and 2002. The median housing value increased about 50 percent compared with about 30 percent inflation between 1990 and 2000. The value increased 18 percent with about 4 percent inflation between 2000 and 2002. Half of Kansas City's housing was built before 1960.

Value of Owner Occupied Units, 1990, 2000, and 2002<sup>29</sup>

Value of Units	1990	2000	2002
	Number (%)	Number (%)	Number (%)
Less than \$50,000	37,689 (41.7%)	21,203 (21.8%)	11,876 (11.3%)
\$50,000-99,999	41,204 (45.6%)	39,419 (40.4%)	41,629 (39.7%)
\$100,000-149,999	7,196 (8.0%)	21,239 (21.8%)	27,078 (25.8%)
\$150,000-199,999	2,247 (2.5%)	8,716 (8.9%)	11,082 (10.6%)
\$200,000-299,999	1,129 (1.3%)	4,434 (4.5%)	9,943 (9.5%)
\$300,000-499,999	818* (0.9%)	1,663 (1.7%)	1,469 (1.4%)
\$500,000 or more		807 (0.8%)	1,848 (1.8%)
Total units	90,283 (100%)	97,481 (100%)	104,925 (100%)
Median Value	\$56,100	\$84,000	\$98,825

\*\$300,000 or more.

Sources: U.S. Bureau of Census, Census 1990 of Population and Housing, Census 2000, and 2002 American Community Survey.

Year Housing Structure Was Built

	Number	Percent
1999 to March 2000	2,980	1.5%
1995 to 1998	8,959	4.4%
1990 to 1994	8,647	4.3%
1980 to 1989	20,025	9.9%
1970 to 1979	27,768	13.7%
1960 to 1969	32,794	16.2%
1940 to 1959	55,417	27.4%
1939 or earlier	45,683	22.6%
Total Housing Units	202,273	100.0%

Sources: U.S. Bureau of Census, *Census 2000*.

<sup>29</sup> The 1990 and 2000 figures are not adjusted for inflation.

While income and housing values have increased over the last decade, homelessness continues to be a problem. Many factors contribute to homelessness, including a shortage of affordable housing, lack of social programs, and loss of detoxification beds. The numbers of homeless individuals and families in November 2002 did not include those on the waiting lists for transitional housing services.


#### Count of Homeless Persons and Families With Children

	Apr 00	Nov 00	Nov 01	Nov 02
Individuals	1,325	1,460	1,347	1,419
Families	678	813	957	737

Sources: Homeless Services Coalition of Greater Kansas City, *Kansas City Missouri – Continuum of Care: Gaps Analysis*, 2000, 2001, 2002, 2003.

The number of homeless children and youths in the Kansas City, Missouri, School District increased significantly in 2003 compared to the same period in 2002.

#### Number of Homeless Children in KCMO District



Source: Homeless Services Coalition of Greater Kansas City.

The number of students who qualified for free or discounted school lunches has risen in past years and reached the highest in 2003. The increased number reflected the declining economy nationwide and its effect to families with school age children. Almost 80 percent of students in the Kansas City, Missouri, School District were eligible for free or discounted lunches. Over half of students were eligible in Center and Hickman Mills school districts. All or almost all of the students in these three school districts are living in Kansas City, Missouri. Almost 40 percent of students statewide qualified for free or reduced-priced lunches in the last three years.

#### Percentage of Students Eligible for Free or Reduced-Priced Lunch

School District	2001	2002	2003	Percent of Students Living in KCMO
Kansas City	74.4	77.8	79.0	100%
Center	52.3	49.8	52.8	100%
Hickman Mills	49.7	51.4	57.4	97%
Park Hill	11.0	13.6	14.7	77%
North Kansas City	22.6	23.8	26.2	73%
Raytown	28.4	30.1	31.8	42%
Liberty	10.7	11.7	11.4	27%
Platte County	10.5	12.9	16.6	25%
Grandview	43.1	41.0	42.5	15%
Independence	33.6	33.9	37.7	2%
Smithville	7.2	6.5	7.9	2%
Lee's Summit	7.2	7.3	8.7	2%
Missouri	36.9	37.9	39.2	

Source: Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education; School Districts.

## Employment

We report unemployment rates and employment growth rates from 1992 through November 2003. The unemployment rate is the number of unemployed as a percent of the civilian labor force. The annual rate is calculated as the average of the monthly unemployment rates during the year. Unemployed persons are all persons who had no employment during the week of the twelfth day of the month, were available for work except for temporary illness, and had made specific efforts to find employment.

The annual employment growth rate is how many more (or fewer, if the rate is negative) individuals living in Kansas City were employed each year.

**Why is it important?** The city's employment base – measured by the unemployment rate and number of jobs – is directly related to business activity and personal income. A declining employment base indicates that overall economic activity is declining. Unemployment is a serious social concern. Unemployed workers and their families face a declining standard of living and pose an increasing demand on the city's social services infrastructure.

**How is the city doing?** Kansas City's employment picture was mixed over the last decade. Unemployment declined in the 1990s, but increased again after 2000. Annual employment growth was flat except for jumps in 1995 and 2000.

Unemployment rates in Kansas City have climbed up since 2000 after years of decline in the 1990s.

Unemployment rates declined from over 6 percent in 1992 and 1993 to a low of 3.9 percent in 1999. However, unemployment in 2002 and 2003 (through November) reached about 7 percent.

### Annual Unemployment Rate (1992-2003)

Year	Average Number of Unemployed Persons per Month	Unemployment rate
1992	14,792	6.2%
1993	15,565	6.6%
1994	13,154	5.5%
1995	13,587	5.4%
1996	12,662	4.9%
1997	11,934	4.7%
1998	11,899	4.7%
1999	9,872	3.9%
2000	10,578	4.0%
2001	14,593	5.4%
2002	18,785	7.1%
2003 thru Nov.	18,428	6.9%

Source: Bureau of Labor Statistics, U.S. Department of Labor.

The annual employment growth rate spiked in 1995 and 2000, reaching 5.5 percent. Growth was negative in 1993, and flat between 1997 and 1999. The growth rates were negative or close to zero in the last 3 years.

## Annual Employment Growth Rate (1992 – 2003)

Year	Average Number of Employed Persons per Month	Annual Employment Growth Rate
1991	220,515	N/A
1992	222,674	1.0%
1993	219,946	-1.2%
1994	226,088	2.8%
1995	238,412	5.5%
1996	243,938	2.3%
1997	242,705	-0.5%
1998	242,612	0.0%
1999	243,269	0.3%
2000	256,560	5.5%
2001	253,649	-1.1%
2002	247,217	-2.5%
2003 thru Nov	248,153	0.4%

Source: Bureau of Labor Statistics Data, U.S. Department of Labor.

### Education

We report educational attainment of Kansas City, Missouri, population over 25 year of age compared to that of the metro area and the U.S. We also report the twelfth grade graduation rates in school districts which are or partially are in Kansas City, Missouri.

Kansas City, Missouri overlaps with 12 school districts. In some school districts, such as Kansas City, Missouri and Center school districts, all the students are Kansas City, Missouri residents. In some school districts, the majority of their students live in Kansas City, Missouri, such as in the Hickman Mills,

Park Hill, and North Kansas City school districts. Some school districts only have a few students who live in Kansas City, Missouri.


### Why is it Important?

Understanding the state of education provides an insight into the knowledge and skills of city residents as they apply these to improve their quality of life. Individual and community levels of education have a strong positive association with a range of economic and social benefits. Over the long term, poor educational performance at school will tend to make it harder for individuals to achieve good levels of income, with all the implications this has for health, housing quality, participation in community life, and eventually the educational achievement of their own children. The concept of education includes lifelong acquisition and accumulation of knowledge and skills. An educated population adds to the vibrancy and creativity of a city and is needed to remain competitive in the regional, national, as well as global economies.

### How is the city doing?

In Kansas City, about 83 percent of the adult population were high school graduates in 2000. This is up from about 79 percent in 1990. More adults had some college education or earned a bachelor's or higher degree in 2000 than in 1990. Compared to the education attainment levels in the metropolitan area and in the nation, Kansas City is in between – it has more adults 25 years of age and over who are high school graduates and more adults who have a bachelor's or higher degree than the nation, but fewer than the metropolitan area.

### Education Attainment of Adults 25 Years Old or Over



Source: U.S. Bureau of Census, *Census 2000*.

High school graduation rates have generally increased over the years in all 12 school districts. However, the graduation rates in the Kansas City, Grandview, Raytown and Center school districts are lower than the state rate.

### High School Graduation Rates by School District

School District	2001	2002	2003	Percent of Students Living in KCMO
Kansas City	63.9	66.8	66.3	100%
Center	77.7	73.8	82.7	100%
Hickman Mills	84.1	82.6	86.2	97%
Park Hill	91.1	91.3	90.5	77%
North Kansas City	83.6	85.0	87.8	73%
Raytown	80.3	80.2	78.2	42%
Liberty	82.3	87.8	86.9	27%
Platte County	86.1	86.0	88.8	25%
Grandview	80.8	77.5	77.5	15%
Independence	75.6	80.5	85.3	2%
Lee's Summit	84.2	91.4	90.0	2%
Smithville	84.7	94.0	91.0	2%
Missouri	81.4	82.4	84.2	

Sources: Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education; School Districts.

### Health

We report measures of infant mortality rate, low birth weight, prenatal care, death rates of major causes, and the percent of persons in the city with no health insurance. The infant mortality rate is the number of infant deaths per 1,000 live births in the year.

Low birth weight refers to infants weighing less than 2,500 grams (5.5 pounds) at birth. The Health Department calculates low birth weight as percentage of live births from birth certificates and the information submitted by hospitals.

Prenatal care means providing care to pregnant women in order to prevent pregnancy-related complications, decrease maternal and prenatal mortality, and lower the chances of birth defects. The Health Department compiles the data according to birth information provided by hospitals.

The death rates by major causes are age-adjusted according to the age distribution of the U.S. population in 2000 for the purpose of comparisons across time and with the national rates. The adjusted death rate is the number of deaths per 100,000 population that would be expected if the age composition of the population in Kansas City, Missouri, were the same as that in the United States in 2000. The death rate by unintentional injury excludes deaths by homicides or suicides, but includes deaths caused by motor vehicle crashes. The Health Department compiles the data from vital records.

**Why is it important?** An individual's health begins before he/she is born. Low birth weight is associated with infant mortality. Both infant death and low birth weight are related to mother's economic status, access to health care, and health related behaviors. Prenatal care improves chances that mothers and babies will be healthy. The goals of *Healthy People 2010 Objectives for the Greater Kansas Metropolitan Community* is to reduce the infant mortality rate to no more than 5 per 1,000 live births, and low birth weight to no more than 5 percent by 2010.

Diseases and injuries shorten and damage people's quality of life. Many diseases and accidents are

preventable through public health education, healthy behaviors, and early diagnoses and treatment.

**How is the city doing?** Measures of health in the city have improved over the past decade. Infant mortality has declined. More women are starting prenatal care during their first trimester and fewer women had no prenatal care at all. Death due to coronary heart disease, cancer, and AIDS/HIV declined. However, Kansas City's deaths due to most major causes are higher than the national average for 2001 and about 14 percent of residents lack health insurance.

Infant mortality rates declined from almost 13 per 1,000 live births in 1991 to 7.4 in 2001, but bounced back to 9.8 in 2002. An increase in sudden infant death syndrome contributed to the increase of the overall infant mortality rate in 2002. Nationally, the rates have been declining. Kansas City's rates are higher than those of the nation. Low birth weight rates dropped in three consecutive years after 1998, but rose in 2002.

Infant Mortality Rate Per 1,000 Live Births		
Year	Kansas City	United States
1990	11.4	9.2
1991	12.9	8.9
1992	12.5	8.5
1993	12.7	8.4
1994	10.3	7.9
1995	9.8	7.6
1996	11.4	7.3
1997	8.9	7.2
1998	8.6	7.2
1999	8.2	7.1
2000	7.8	6.9
2001	7.4	6.8
2002	9.8	n/a

Source: Health Department.

The percent of women receiving no prenatal care during their entire pregnancy dropped from 2.1 percent in 1998. The percent of women receiving no prenatal care in their first trimester has been dropping continuously since 1993. This means more women began prenatal care during their first trimester, from around 80 percent in the early 1990s to near 88 percent in 2000 and 2001.

The three leading causes of death in Kansas City are cancer, coronary heart disease, and stroke. Death rates due to these diseases have generally declined over the past decade, but the stroke rate increased in 2002.


Birth Weight Less than 2,500 grams	
Year	Percent of live births weighing less than 2,500 grams (5.5 lbs.)
1991	9.6%
1992	9.5%
1993	9.8%
1994	9.6%
1995	9.2%
1996	9.1%
1997	9.3%
1998	9.7%
1999	9.4%
2000	8.7%
2001	8.4%
2002	9.0%

Source: Health Department.

Deaths due to AIDS/HIV dropped significantly in the last six years. However, deaths due to motor vehicle crash and unintentional injury have increased. Kansas City's age-adjusted death rates are higher than for the United States as a whole for most major causes.

Finally, we asked respondents to the DirectionFinder survey how many people in their household were covered by some type of health insurance. About 14 percent of the persons in surveyed households had no health insurance.

Lack of Prenatal Care 1991-2001



Source: Health Department.



Age-Adjusted Death Rates (Number Per 100,000 Population) Due To  
Major Causes 1990-2001

Year	Major Causes						
	Coronary Heart Disease	Cancer	Stroke	Motor Vehicle Crash	AIDS/HIV	Unintentional Injury	Diabetes
1990	257	248.6	71	16.9	17.9	34.4	21
1991	257	244.6	69	17.0	18.7	38.7	25
1992	251	244.4	68	13.8	26.6	34.8	23
1993	245	230.3	74	17.1	27.6	38.5	25
1994	248	230.8	71	11.9	26.4	31.0	30
1995	212	244.2	62	15.7	24.3	36.7	28
1996	224	227.6	66	19.8	17.2	41.5	28
1997	226	220.6	66	16.2	8.8	41.6	29
1998	218	243.3	62	15.0	9.3	43.5	31
1999	206	210.7	64	12.5	6.9	40.2	33
2000	198	214.0	65	12.6	8.4	31.2	31
2001	180	217.0	58	13.8	7.1	41.6	33
2002	161	201.4	66	14.1	4.1	42.7	29
2001	n/a						
U.S.		194.4	57.4	15.2	5.0	35.7	25.1

Source: Health Department.